THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1892.

I.

THE DIVINE-HUMAN PERSON OF CHRIST.

BY REV. T. G. APPLE, D.D., LL.D.

THE difficulties in regard to the doctrine of the person of Christ circle around the conception of His personality. The definitions given by the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan creed and the creed of Chalcedon decided that Christ is divine and human; that His divinity is coequal with that of the Father and the Holy Spirit; that His humanity includes a human body, soul and spirit; that He has therefore two natures, divine and human; that these two natures remain distinct, though not separated, being united in one personality.

The most difficult point is that which concerns the character of His personality. This, it was said, is divine, the personality of the Logos, and therefore His humanity, it would seem, is without personality, *anhypostasia*. The difficulty here is to conceive of a complete humanity, including body, soul and spirit, and also a human will, as distinguished from a divine will, and yet not a human personality. Will is an attribute—

a necessary attribute—of personality. It is the *ego* that wills; how then can there be a human will in Christ without a human personality?

The reason why there can be no human personality in Christ as urged against Nestorius, is because that would require the dualism of two persons in the one Christ, which, it was thought, would be a monstrosity. Christ is one person, not two persons. If He were two complete persons, then He would have to be a complete person from the Virgin Mary, which became joined then to His divine person afterwards, and that would destroy the mystery of His holy conception and birth. It is conceded that He was conceived and born without the agency of a human father, but if He were a complete human person, then He must have had a human father, and then also the divine might as well have joined itself to this human person after His birth —say at His baptism—as the Gnostics held. The union would not then have taken place in His conception, as it did, according to the Scriptures. And besides we would be confronted with the difficulty how two persons could live and act as one, as our Lord did.

The difficulty then gathers itself up in this: How could there be a human will in Christ without a human *ego*, a human personality? I think the only solution of this difficulty is to grant that there is a sense, though not the sense of Nestorius, in which Christ has a human personality. We say, not in the sense of the theory of Nestorius, which required the dualism of two persons. What, then, can that sense be? In what sense can our Lord have a human personality without resulting in the monstrosity of being two separate and independent persons?

I answer in the sense that *the one divine personality of the Logos fills the place and acts in the capacity of a human personality.**

* If any one should feel that there is a lack of reverence in using a mathematical figure to serve as an analogy, or illustration, of the holy mystery of the person of our Lord, we can only say that all truth, whether in science or religion, is from God, and it is only natural that we should find semblances of

An illustration, imperfect as it may be, may be given of two concentric circles, two circles, the one in the other, and both having *one centre*. Suppose a centre of a boundless circle, so far as we can conceive of such a thing, at any rate a circle with a centre, whose circumference is beyond finite conception, to represent the divine person of the Logos. He has a personality, a centre of a boundless person, or being. Now let a finite circumference be drawn around the same centre, and you have two circles with but one centre. The one is limited, and thus represents the humanity of our Lord; the other is boundless, and thus represents His divinity.

I know it will be said that the conception of a boundless circle is a contradiction, an absurdity, because a circle implies a centre and a circumference, whereas in the supposed case there is no circumference. But this is only a difficulty we meet with in every conception of the being of God. For our finite thinking we need only to say that the circumference is indefinite, for that, after all, is the only conception we can form of infinity. Yet this does not contradict the *idea* of infinity, because we have such an idea, even though we cannot form a *conception* which is adequate to the idea. This is only saying that man has an intuition of the infinite and absolute, whilst his understanding cannot form a conception adequate to the intuition. In other words, there is in the human *reason*, or intuition, an *idea* of God, as being an infinite and absolute being, whilst yet man cannot form an adequate conception of such a being in the logical *understanding* as distinguished from the reason.

But this is leading us into a digression. It is not our purpose to discuss the Kantian problem of the unknowableness of God. In other connections we might attempt to show that the view of Kant, of Sir William Hamilton and others of that agnostic school, is erroneous, though it contains a partial truth

His nature and being in all His works. After all we use it only to illustrate the abstract truth that there may be one centre for two surroundings, whether in the organic or inorganic creation, well knowing that any such illustration is far from adequate in any other respect.

which may perhaps be gathered by the careful reader from the distinction we have made between the human reason and the *idea* and the logical understanding and its *conception*. At present we assume that we have an idea of an infinite God who is a personal being and therefore has a centre which we call personality.

Now, having explained the figure employed in illustration, the question remains to be discussed whether and how the divine personality of our Lord can become, and act in the capacity of, a human personality, and yet remain divine. I know this question embraces the whole mystery as to whether, and how, the infinite can become finite, God become man. In other words, is it possible for the infinite God to enter into the limitations of finite man, so as to be real and true man, whilst He continues to be real and true God. But it seems to me the difficulties connected with the whole problem can be considered to best advantage by reducing them to this point: can the divine personality, or *ego*, be at the same time the personal centre of the full and complete humanity in Christ, and still remain divine? If it can, then the human will in Christ has found its personality, its centre, and that centre fills the place of a human personality, and therefore is practically human, and so, *in a sense*, though not in the sense of *Nestorius*, Christ has a human personality.

To discuss this question it is necessary to consider how the human personality is related to the divine personality.

We may quote here, as *apropos*, from an article in the *Independent* of May 12th, from the pen of Dr. E. H. Johnston, of Crozier Theological Seminary, though we cannot endorse some of his conclusions, especially the one which seems to consider it necessary to identify the two natures in Christ, somewhat after the old theory of the *Monophysites*. He says on the subject of the one personality of our Lord:

"But would Jesus be a real man, according to this physiological account of His origin? No, He would not, except for one thing; it is coming to be recognised that the divine spirit is of the same species or kind of being as a human soul. The distinction between God and the soul of man is in extent of powers, not in kind of nature; quantitative, not qualitative. If this be a

true opinion, then Christ was a real man, though He had a divine Father. The union of the Word with the mother element in His soul rounded out on the one hand His humanity, on the other hand the personality of the Word Himself. So far as I know, orthodox trinitarians are prompt to concede that neither of the persons in the Godhead, some might except the Father, is by Himself a 'person' in the ordinary meaning of the term.

"This doctrine of specific identity, with numerical distinctness, between God and the human soul, would seem to be approximated in the teaching that God made man in His image; that is, unlike the beasts, a person. It is boldly put forward by Luke when he makes Adam hold the same relation to God that Seth held to Adam, and that Jesus was 'supposed' to hold to Joseph. Luke cannot mean that God begat Adam; but he must mean that Adam's nature was what it would have been were he what Luke called him, 'the son of God.' If evidence less purely verbal is required—evidence which goes to the core of the case—is it not found in the fact that Jesus was not the monstrous offspring of two species, not a hybrid? He was, at the same time, man and God; but He was not the less God for being the son of Mary, nor the less man for being the Son of God."

What he says of the divine spirit and the human soul I would say of the divine personality and the human personality; they differ, so to speak, quantitatively, not qualitatively. Human personality is a miniature of the divine personality, or as the Scripture expresses it, the image and likeness of the divine; for this image and likeness must be predicated of the wholeness of man, as contained in his personality, his *ego*.

Now where the quality is the same, the higher includes in itself the lower, and can therefore take the place, and act in the capacity, of the lower.

This implies that humanity was eternal ideally in the Logos. He was the archetype of man, and for this reason man was created in the image and likeness of God. When the Logos assumed humanity He really and truly *came to His own*.

If a king takes the place of a servant he needs not to change his essential being, for the servant is a man as well as the king. The higher here can take the place of the lower. He can become a servant really and truly, and act in all respects in the capacity of a servant, without necessarily laying aside his humanity, nor absolutely giving up even his kingship. This latter must indeed be held in abeyance, must be limited to the

character of the servant, whilst he may still retain a consciousness of his royal nature.

So we are told in the epistle to the Philippians, that our Lord, whilst not thinking it robbery to be equal with God, yet took upon him the form of a servant, and humbled himself, etc. His divine personality, taking the place of the human personality, acted now through His human nature as its organ, and therefore its power and capacity of necessity became limited to the unfolding organ through which it acted, and yet as His life unfolded He had a growing consciousness of His divine nature which had voluntarily humbled itself in taking the form of a servant. The organ conditioned the activity of the personality, and He would, by no act of violence, break up this relation. His human will was the organ, in its sphere, for His personality, and this found its limits and capabilities in the divine will, or the law of God. As Logos His will was the divine will, which was at the same time the will of the Father and the Holy Spirit, for there is but one will in the Godhead; but now as human His will conformed itself to what was above it, and this by the activity and direction of His divine personality.

Must He not then have had two consciousnesses, one as man and one as God, and would not this be a dualism like that of the view of Nestorius? Of course we are confronted with a mystery here which we cannot fully fathom, but we may be aided in trying to comprehend it by an analogy. Every man, in the constitution of his person, has a sense of a twofold source of his being, or a twofold paternity, and yet his consciousness remains one. He has a sense of his human origin, or parentage, and at the same time he feels that his origin is in God, and that God is his father. As his consciousness unfolds, this God-consciousness unfolds, and moulds his self-consciousness. Consciousness in man is, we may say, threefold, self-consciousness, world-consciousness, and God-consciousness. The consciousness of the *ego* and the *non-ego*, of the *me* and the *not-me*, condition each other. God-consciousness unites these two, giving a sense of the union of self and the not-self, or the world, in one common

origin. Now what we mean to illustrate by this is, that there may be a twofold consciousness, of our human origin and our divine origin, and yet no disturbance of the unity of our being, our personality. This simply means that God can enter into every human being without disturbing the human personality, or human consciousness. And this adumbrates the mystery of the incarnation. The difference is that in the person of Christ the union is *hypostatic*, an *essential* union of God and man; whereas in the case of man in general the union is one of the divine influence operating upon the human soul—a moral union. In the case of a Christian it is called the *mystical* union in distinction from a *hypostatic* union. Man is then united to God, and becomes a partaker of the divine nature, as it is stated in one of the epistles of St. Peter, but this union is mediated by the life of Christ. A Christian becomes a partaker of the glorified humanity of Christ, which is signified by eating His flesh and drinking His blood, without which, our Saviour declares, no one can have eternal life.

Christ Himself uses this analogy to show to the Jews that a union of man with God was not something unnatural, or contrary to the original constitution of man. The Jews accused Him of blasphemy because, being a man, He made Himself God. "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods?" If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" (John 10: 34–36.) Christ does not mean here to reduce the mystery to a lower plane, does not mean to imply that the union of the divine and human in Him may be merely a moral union, such as was predicated of those in the Old Testament to whom the word of God came; but He holds up their case to show the original affinity of the human for union with the divine. Such moral union foreshadowed and prophesied the greater mystery of the incarnation, and He refers to that union in order to assist their faith to grasp the still greater mysterious

union in His own person. If there is such an affinity on the part of man for union with God, does not that very fact point to the complete and essential union of the divine and human in the God-man? *

Now our argument, in referring to this analogy, is that if in such moral union the divine may be present in the human soul, guiding and directing it, without disturbing the human consciousness, the same may be true where this union reaches its highest consummation in the person of Christ. He is conscious that He is the Son of God and the Son of Man, and yet He is one being, the God-man.

Just here we may find the key to unlock the mystery of the person of our Lord in such way as to escape the Gnostic heresy. That heresy denied the essential reality of His humanity, made it to be a mere appearance, an illusion. Now if the personality of Christ is purely divine, in such sense as to provide no human personality, then the tendency is to make His humanity something unreal. With His purely divine consciousness, He *appeared* to share in all the attributes, the weaknesses and imperfections of humanity, but this was not real. Whilst He *seemed* to increase in knowledge, yet He was in conscious exercise of omniscience. In other words, His divinity stood above and apart from His humanity, and had no part nor share in the development of His humanity. It was not the

* We read recently somewhere a sermon by Dr. Lyman Abbott on this passage, in which he takes the view that our Lord's argument here favors such lowering of the character of the union of the divine and human in Christ to the plane of a mere moral union, the same in kind as may have place in any man who is a recipient of divine grace. Christ possessed this divine grace (or life he might call it) in its fullness, but not in the sense of a hypostatic union. We need not say that this is not our view; but it is simply the view put forth by Strauss, according to which every man is a God-man; though singularly Strauss employed it to prove that Christ is not divine in any other sense than other men are divine. We incline to think that Dr. Abbott must reach substantially the same conclusion. We regard the argument of the Lord in that passage as a help to enable His hearers to rise from this moral union of man with God to the higher mystery of the unique union in His own person, the mystery of the Word made flesh.

divine Christ, but only the human who increased in wisdom and in favor with God and man; it was merely the human and not divine Christ that suffered and died upon the cross for man's redemption. Thus there is introduced a Nestorian dualism.

But now grant that the one personality was human as well as divine, or that the divine personality acted really and truly in the capacity of the human personality, then we can see how everything that Christ did can be predicated of His personality. It was not His divine nature that suffered on the cross, but neither was it His human nature, as such, apart from His divine nature; but it was the person who suffered through His humanity as its organ. The whole person of Christ suffered, yet not through the divine, but through the human nature.

When a man suffers pain, it is the *ego* that suffers; but the body is the organ through which the *ego* suffers. It is not the body, as such, apart from the soul, that suffers, but the person suffers. So the person of Christ suffered through His humanity. Taking this view, we can accord a measure of truth to the old theological view that the divinity of Christ did not suffer, whilst we can assert at the same time that the Christ, and the whole Christ, suffered.

The Apostle Peter said that he also was an elder, the greater including the less, and so, though of course in a deeper sense, Christ could be man in the inmost constitution of His personality. This view does not remove all difficulty in endeavoring to conceive of the person of Christ; but it locates the difficulty where it affords least hindrance to a proper apprehension of the mystery. If the personality of the Logos could fill the place of a human personality in Christ, without interfering with the unity of His being as one Christ, then we can see the full humanity of Christ in union with His divinity.

But this view (and every other view, it may be added, that accords with the Chalcedon Creed) implies that the personality of the Logos limited itself to the capacities and possibilities of the human nature which He had joined with the divine nature. His personality, His consciousness, unfolded itself gradually.

He was limited in power and in knowledge. Even in his moral nature He made progress; for it is said that "He learned obedience by the things He suffered."

Here we reach the problem of the *Kenosis*, which was discussed by the Lutheran divines already in the sixteenth century. The word *kenosis*, as is known to theologians, is taken from the passage, already referred to, Phil. 2: 6, et seq., which Thayer, in his New Testament Lexicon, translates as follows: "*Who, although* (formerly when he was *λόγος ἄσαρκος*) *he bore the form* (in which he appeared to the inhabitants of heaven) *of God* (the sovereign, opposed to *μορφ. δούλου*), *yet did not think that this equality with God was to be eagerly clung to* or *retained* (see *ἁρπαγμός*, 2), *but emptied himself of it* (see *κενόω*, 1), *so as to assume the form of a servant, in that he became like unto men* (for angels are also *δοῦλοι τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Rev. 19: 10; 22: 8 sq.), *and was found in fashion as a man.*"

The verb *ἐκένωσεν* is here translated: "He emptied himself of it" (the form of God, *μορφὴ θεοῦ*); and the question is, What is meant by emptying Himself of the form of God? Did the Logos lay aside or limit the attributes of His divinity when He became man, or were they in full exercise along with the attributes or capacities of His humanity? We do not propose to consider this question, except as it is involved in what is said of the Lord's personality. His personality may be called *theanthropic*, yet not in the sense of a *tertium quid*, formed by a mixture of a divine and a human *ego*, or personality, but in the sense that the divine, whilst it remains divine, nevertheless fills the place at the same time of the human personality.

Now let us apply this conclusion to the unfolding life of Jesus. From His birth on, He had a consciousness of the development of His being according to all the limitations of sinless human nature, and even that sinlessness was made a product of His own will, and not something imposed from a foreign source; for He said to His disciples: "For this cause I sanctify myself," etc.; and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, already

quoted: "He learned obedience by the things he suffered." He really and truly, and not merely in appearance, passed through all the stages of human life, infancy, childhood, youth and manhood. He was ignorant, like all other children, and had to acquire an education. He had a moral and spiritual development, so that when He came to years of knowledge, He made His own the consecration which His parents made for Him in infancy. He was really and truly tempted in the wilderness, and He gained the victory by the determination of His will. In all His official life He subjected His human will to the divine will. He was divine also; but His divinity never interfered with the free activity and development of His human nature, never coerced His human will. We may here revert to the analogy already given of the activity of God in all men. That activity acts upon conscience; but it never coerces man's will so as to destroy his freedom of choice.

Now, although the divine was in Christ in greater measure than in any other man, was in Him in all the fulness of the Godhead (for we are told that "in him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily"), yet it left the human free in its growth and development, in all its activities. Thus we find a truly human Christ, the Son of Man.

He was also divine, the Son of God. His complete, perfect humanity already proves that He was more than man. His divinity shone through His humanity in His teaching, in His miraculous works, in His triumph over death and the grave, and especially in His final glorification. After He arose from the dead, He said to His disciples: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth." He prayed: "Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.' This, indeed, was the mystery that He on all occasions pressed upon His hearers, viz., that although He stood before them as man, yet He was the Son of God, equal with the Father and the Holy Ghost. This was the mystery that challenged their faith, because it could not be apprehended by the mind merely, but required a spiritual sympathy with what is godlike; yea,

it required a yielding to the drawing of the Father. "No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." And when Peter made the great confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," he said: "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto you, but my Father which is in heaven."

God is spirit, and therefore to reveal Himself to man He took upon Himself the form of the highest intelligent creature He had made (at least one of the highest), whom He had made in His own image, *man*. To recognize God in this form required spiritual susceptibility, a susceptibility to apprehend infinite purity and truth and love in such outward form.

Man He had to be, in order to rehead the race as the last Adam, in order to make atonement for the sin of the world in the form of him who had sinned, in order to be the brother of all men, in short, in order to be the mediator between God and man.

Divine He had to be in order to be the final, absolute, revelation of God to man, in order to be the source of eternal life to mankind. "As the Father hath life in himself, even so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself."

His divinity, or deity, however, reaches us only through the human as its organ. Hence His humanity was not merely a temporary form, which He might wear for a time, for the single purpose of making atonement for man in His death upon the cross; but it continues forever in heaven as the organ through which eternal life is communicated to man. Hence also believers must become partakers of His glorified humanity. "Except any one eat my flesh and drink my blood he hath no life in him." "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. The mystery of eating His flesh and drinking His blood here referred to, is not, indeed, limited to partaking of the Lord's Supper, but includes the whole mystery of receiving into the soul His glorified humanity in the new birth, but it does also include the transaction in that holy Supper, for all those who are self-conscious believers.

Hence the deep interest always taken in holding to the presence of the body and blood (humanity) of Christ in that Supper. Calvin lays especial stress upon the participation of the humanity of the Lord on the part of all believers, and hence he incorporated the idea of such participation in his doctrine of the Eucharist. It was not an unimportant, but a vital, matter about which the Reformers contended in their controversy on this holy sacrament.

But we are, perhaps, transcending the limits of our special subject in these remarks. Our object has been to show the practical importance of conceiving aright of the character of our Lord's person. It is not to be inferred that such understanding intellectually is necessary for all for salvation. Any one who believes that Jesus Christ is the Son of God may be saved. But to maintain this faith in the form of doctrine it is necessary to remove those obstacles out of the way that arise to disturb this faith, or becloud this doctrine. And one of these obstacles lies just here: How can I conceive of Christ as being both God and man in one person? Some believe in Him as man, as human only, and deny His divinity; while others believe in His divinity and set aside the reality of His humanity. But if He be real and true man, must He not have a human personality? This question we have tried to answer by advocating the view that His divine personality fills the place of the human, and thus there is in Him a human personality without dividing His one person.

This is not a merely speculative question, but intensely practical; for we believe this difficulty in regard to the human personality of Christ has stood much in the way of holding to His real humanity. If His personality is purely, only, divine, then it is difficult to conceive how He could act in every sense as truly man; but if we can hold that His divine personality acts in the place of the human, and thus becomes truly human whilst it remains divine, then we can see how He can act always as man.

The *Andover* theology has been for some time emphasizing this side of the mystery of Christ's person, His humanity. It

has been dwelling upon the *Incarnation* as lying at the basis of all that followed in the life of Christ. This, over against the view that the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin is the deepest, and the central, fact in the life of Christ. The death of Christ is central in redemption, but Christ came not only to redeem man, but to unite him in union with God. The incarnation is the central fact in regard to this union, and it is the deepest fact in revelation. Moreover Christ assumed human nature, not merely in order that He might have a human body for sacrifice, but His glorified humanity is the perpetual organ for conveying eternal life to His people. And in this view Christ is not only the means, or instrument, but He is also the source of salvation.

The *Andover Review* is now engaged in bringing out a series of articles on the divinity of Christ, in order, no doubt, to complement the articles on His humanity.

May it not be that the tendency to emphasize the divinity of Christ in such way as to overlook His true humanity, has been one occasion for the rise of the Unitarian belief? That belief seeks to find a true brotherhood in Christ, to bring Him near to every man in sympathy, and this perhaps was somewhat missing in the effort to emphasize the Saviour's divinity to the neglect of emphasizing His true humanity as well. The divinity of Christ is, indeed, central in the Christian faith, but along with this there is a yearning in all human hearts for a Saviour who is truly human, flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone. We desire to find in Him also our perfect example, and this He cannot be if His humanity is not real. When it is said He was tempted in all respects as we yet without sin, we feel that this could not be unless He contended against evil with the same nature and will as our own, that the temptation was not an appearance merely, but real.

If we have succeeded in showing that our Saviour has virtually and substantially a human personality, though not in such sense as to interfere with the unity of His person, and thus aided in the conception of His real and true humanity, our object has been attained.

II.

ORIGINAL BUDDHISM.

BY PROF. E. V. GERHART, D.D., LL.D.

AMONG all nations there is no people more religious, more metaphysical, and I may add none more ethical, than the inhabitants of Hindustan. Composed of different nationalities, holding various religious beliefs, and differing in their conceptions of what is obligatory and what is not obligatory, yet an intense religiosity is the marked characteristic of the Hindu. True it is that this feature distinguishes all oriental peoples; but judging from the reports we get from travelers and missionaries, the number of whose reports and well digested representations is multiplying from year to year, Hindustan stands out prominently for its religious genius.

We may distinguish roughly between three great branches of belief: Hinduism, Brahmanism, Buddhism. Brahmanism and Hinduism are in reality not two systems; practically they are one. Hinduism is merely an expansion of Brahmanism, modified by contact with Buddhism.

Brahmanism is spiritual pantheism. As Monier-Williams represents Brahmanism, it is a belief in the universal diffusion of an impersonal spirit, as the only really existing essence, called Brahma, and in its manifesting itself in mind and in countless material forces and forms, including gods, demons, men, and animals, which, after fulfilling their course, must ultimately be reabsorbed into the one impersonal essence and be again evolved in endless evolution and dissolution. There is no definite perception of personality either of man or of God. The law of human life and the law of the lower kingdoms of nature are identical. The process of reproduction going on in the

vegetable kingdom is the process of reproduction going on in the human kingdom.

"Hinduism," says the author who has just been quoted, "with its worship of Vishnu and Siva, is based on the pantheistic doctrine, but the majority of the Hindus are merely observers of Brahmanical institutions with their accompanying Hindu caste-usages." *

Buddhism is directly the opposite of Brahmanism, especially the system as taught by Gautama and originally held by his followers. In Brahmanism it is the idea of the Divine that is dominant, in Buddhism the dominant principle is the Human.

But before I attempt to represent the leading features of original Buddhism it is important to emphasize one reigning idea common to oriental religions. That idea, as it is commonly called, is the transmigration of souls. No belief is more deep-seated and firmly rooted in the oriental mind.

* Of all the authors I have read on Gautama and his system of pessimistic philosophy, I have found Monier-Williams to be most thorough, learned and satisfactory. His work entitled: "Buddhism in its Connexion with Brahmanism and Hinduism, and in its Contrast with Christianity," is based, not on the results of investigations made by other scholars, but on his own original, patient researches made in Hindustan, by studying the literature of Buddhism in the Pali language and by traveling through the land where the system was first taught by Gautama. Of his book and of himself he says in the Preface:

"I have aimed at effecting what no other English Orientalist has, to my knowedge, ever accomplished. I have endeavored to deal with a complex subject as a whole, and to present in one volume a comprehensive survey of the entire range of Buddhism, from its earliest origin in India to its latest modern developments in other Asiatic countries.

"I have brought to the study of Buddhism and its sacred language Pali, a life-long preparatory study of Brahmanism and its sacred language Sanskrit.

"I have on three occasions traveled through the sacred land of Buddhism, and have carried on my investigations personally in the land of its origin, as well as in Ceylon and on the borders of Tibet."

His representation goes to the root of the system, which is a philosophy rather than a religion, and is throughout self-consistent, a system which in many of its precepts resembles the precepts of Christ, but as to its principle and substance is at war with the genius of the Christian Religion.

To Monier-Williams more than to all other authors I am indebted for the contents of this article.

As in the kingdoms of nature there is a process of transformation going on in constant succession from age to age, so, it is held, the same process is going on in the human race. In the inorganic world there is integregation, accretion, formation according to natural law, followed by disintegration and dissolution. In the organic world we have the seed growing into the plant, the plant producing the bud, the flower, the fruit containing the seed after its kind, followed by decay and death. Then from the new seed the same process of development is begun which runs through the same cycle of changes. So is man. A child is the present form of the existence of a soul which for ages has been passing through innumerable transformations of plants, of lower or higher grade, of animals, of fishes or birds, of horses or lions, of tigers or elephants, or of demons or gods, until at length the soul appears on the plane of human life. Here it moves through the same cycle of growth and maturity, of decline and death. But human death is not extinction.

Death immediately transfers the soul into the form of some lower or higher animal, into a demon or a god, thrusting him lower down or raising him higher up. If the soul has in this life accumulated a large amount of merits, death may transform its embodiment at once into a well-fed and richly-caparisoned horse, instead of a beast of burden. If in this life the soul fails to accumulate merits it will at death reappear in a serpent, a lizard, a toad or a bug. This process is interminable. Whether at death the human soul becomes a noble steed or a venomous serpent, in either case, that is only a fresh beginning of a continued series of painful transformations. Even if the soul is transformed into a god, that elevation may not be permanent. Hindu belief accepts the possibility, even the probability, of the transformation of a god into a lower order of existence. Then the same process of birth and death, of death and birth, is resumed, and it may go on age after age through all the realms of the universe.

Constant and interminable transformation of the world is the ruling idea of Hindu philosophy. The universe of things good

and bad, high and low, is a circular motion, ever recurring, ever repeating itself, through all the ages, without an assignable reason, without known purpose, producing pain, suffering, sorrow. The lines of Shelly are quoted by Monier-Williams as fitly picturing this Hindu philosophy:

> Worlds on Worlds are rolling ever,
> From creation to decay;
> Like the bubbles on a river,
> Sparkling, bursting, borne away.

Buddhism, at first glance the opposite of Brahmanism, is nevertheless in truth only a modification of it. Both are at bottom a species of pessimistic pantheism. A brief history of Buddha may serve as a representation of the leading features of his system.

The best authorities reject the notion that the Buddha is a myth. The evidences, in the opinion of the most learned orientalists, are adequate to justify the belief that his person and life are historical.

The Buddha was born about the year 500 B. C. His individual name was *Gautama*, in the Pali language *Gotama*. His father was Suddhodana, a large land-owner of the tribe of the Sākyas, whose territory extended from the lower Nepalese mountains to the river Rapti in the province of Oudh. Gautama was known by his individual name up to the time of his supposed attainment of perfect wisdom, when he assumed the title of Buddha, meaning "the enlightened one," the one who has true knowledge and pursues the right course of life.

In accord with the doctrine of transmigration the birth of the Gautama Buddha was a rebirth. He existed previously in the Tushita heaven. When the full time came to be born on earth, as the legend relates, he became the child of his mother, whose name was Maya, descending in the form of a white elephant. As he grew up no efforts were made to imbue him with sacred learning. His love of contemplation developed itself very early, and he was allowed to pass most of his time in the open air.

According to the universal custom throughout India Gautama

was made to marry at the age of sixteen or seventeen, and he had probably at least one son whose name was Rāhula.

At the age of twenty-nine the sense of the vanity of all human aims grew upon him, and he was forming the resolution to abandon all worldly ties and enter upon a monastic life. The final resolve he was led to make in consequence of four visions. One day riding in his chariot there appeared before his eyes the form of a decrepit old man, his skin shrivelled, his head bald, his teeth gone, his body infirm and bent.

Soon another strange sight came before him: A sick man, worn by disease and suffering, pale and miserable, tottering on the road. The third vision was a corpse, borne on a bier.

Next day appeared a man with a shaven crown and a monk's robe, his right shoulder bare, a religious staff in his right hand, and a mendicant's alms-bowl in his left. Gautama asked the man to give an account of his condition. The man answered: "I am called a homeless ascetic; I have forsaken the world, relatives and friends; I seek deliverance from myself, and desire the salvation of all creatures, and I do harm to none."

After hearing these words, Gautama went to his father and said: "I wish to become a wandering ascetic, and to seek Nirvāna; all worldly things are changeable and transitory."

His resolution was taken, and firmly he stood by it. All efforts to restrain him were in vain. About this time, it is said, he receives intelligence of the birth of his son Rāhula. This is a crisis. He sees in his child the strongest of all fetters, binding him to family and home. The beautiful women of his father's household strive to divert him from his purpose, but in vain. "He seeks the chamber of his wife, and finds her asleep with her hand on the head of his infant son. He longs for a last embrace; but fearing to arouse her suspicions hurries away. Outside, his favorite horse is waiting to aid his flight." His departure Buddhists call "the great going forth from home."

Then follow the temptations of Māra, the evil deity; but the tempter's allurements are all repelled. Gautama exclaims: "I would rather be torn to pieces limb by limb, or be burnt in a

fiery furnace, or be ground in pieces by a falling mountain than forego my fixed purpose for one single instant."

What was Gautama's fixed purpose? Not to enter into communion with God; not to fit himself to receive a revelation from God; not to teach men the way of eternal life. His purpose was directly the opposite: to extinguish all desires, all the instincts of the body, all the affections of the soul, and reduce himself if possible to non-existence. This purpose he could accomplish chiefly in two ways: by torturing his body, and by reflection on himself.

Putting on the garments of a beggar, he first becomes a disciple of the Brahmans; but Brahamanical philosophy does not afford him the peace for which his soul is craving.

As Brahmanic philosophy does not afford relief, he resorts to another way of emancipation taught by the Brahmans, the way called Tapas, the severest bodily mortification, consisting in fasting and self-inflicted tortures.

In company with five other ascetics, Gautama begins his celebrated fast of six years, "Sitting down with his legs folded under him, on a raised seat in a place unsheltered from sun, wind, rain, dew and cold, he gradually reduced his daily allowance of food to a single grain of rice. Then holding his breath, he harassed and macerated his body. But all in vain. No peace of mind came."

Then convinced of his folly, and arousing himself, he took food in a natural way. When refreshed he moved away to another spot; there under the shelter of a fig-tree, he gave himself up to intense and prolonged meditation upon himself. The method of meditation (Dhyana) in vogue among the Brahmans is prescribed by the laws of Manu, who lived not earlier than the second century B. C., and possibly as late as the second century of the Christian era. Manu says: Let the devotee "purge himself from all taints by suppression of breath, from sin by restraints of thought, from sensual attachments by control, and from unspiritual qualities by meditation." In another work the Brahmanic rule gives this direction: "Holding his

body, head, and neck quite immovable, seated on a firm seat in a pure spot with grass around, the devotee should look only at the tip of his nose, and should meditate on the Supreme Being." He is directed to meditate so profoundly as to think about nothing whatever.*

Engaging in meditation according to these rules, Gautama was again assailed by the temptations of Mara, the evil spirit. This time the assault was more terrific than before. Mara, the destroyer, seized the opportunity when from protracted self-mortification Gautama had but little power of resistance. The evil spirit said: Why not return to the world? Why not indulge in pleasures? Why not go back to home, wife, and child?

But Gautama withstood the attack. "After rising to higher and higher stages of abstract meditation at the end of a long night, he shook off his foe. The victory was won, and the light of true knowledge broke upon his mind. A legend relates that in the first night-watch he gained a knowledge of all his previous existences; in the second, a knowledge of all present states of being; in the third night-watch, a knowledge of the chain of causes and effects; and at the dawn of day Gautama knew all things."

The dawn of the day on which this struggle ended was the birthday of Buddhism. Gautama was about thirty-five years of age, when he gained a right to the title of Buddha, the Enlightened. The tree under which he sat became celebrated as the tree of knowledge and enlightenment. It is called the Bodhi

* Dhyana or intense abstract meditation is the chief religious exercise, and is divided into four stages: The *first* stage consists in fixing the mind on some object, in such a way that a state of ecstatic joy and serenity is attained. The *second* consists in concentrating the soul so intensely on itself that the thinking faculties cease to act. In the *third* nothing remains but serenity. The *fourth* is a trance-like condition of utter indifference and torpor, in which there is neither any exercise of thought, nor any conscious joy or serenity, but the whole being is released from the fetters of sense, and soars to a transcendental condition characterised by a latent energy and a power of working miracles.—*Buddhism, by Monier-Williams*, p. 209.

tree, or in familiar language Bo-tree, and is the most sacred symbol among Buddhists; just as the night on which Gautama obtained perfect enlightenment is the most sacred night.

The first words said to have been spoken by Gautama as the utterance of his perfect enlightenment were to this effect: "Through countless births have I wandered, seeking but not discovering the Maker of this my mortal dwelling-house, and still again and again have birth and life and pain returned. But now at length art Thou discovered, Thou Builder of this house of flesh. No longer shalt thou rear a house for me. Rafters and beams are shattered with destruction of Desire, deliverance from repeated life is gained at last."

After obtaining this complete enlightenment Buddha sat cross-legged on the ground under the Bo-tree for seven days absorbed in meditation, when he thought out the law of causation.

Next he meditated for another seven days under a Banyan tree. Then he meditated under another tree for a third period of seven days. A fourth period of meditation was passed under another tree, making four times seven days. During this long period of meditation he fasted. Then he arose and went forth to preach his doctrine from place to place, gathering his followers into companies of monks. Continuing this work of itineration for forty-five years, he died, it is said, at the age of eighty.*

Now let us inquire: What did this enlightenment consist in? The answer is this: By intense thought Gautama came to see that *all existence is evil*, the life of man is only pain and suffering; and this suffering runs on endlessly in an inexorable succession of births and rebirths. What is the cause of this suffering? The answer is *existence*, individual and personal existence. To get rid of personal existence is to get rid of suffering. That is the only alternative. If there be no individual, no embodied soul, there can be no suffering.

* A tradition says that the immediate cause of his death was an immoderate meal of pork.

But how shall a man get rid of existence? The answer is by annulling the cause. Then he inquires what is the cause of individual existence? The answer is *birth*. If there be absolutely no birth, no rebirth of the individual soul, there can be no existence. Then the problem is how to destroy the possibility of birth and rebirth. In the effort to solve this problem we get the philosophy of Buddhism. On this philosophy at bottom rests the entire Buddhistic system. This wisdom he gained absolutely from himself. The Buddha never claimed to be the channel of supernatural revelation. "He always maintained the only revelation he had received was an illumination from within, due entirely to his own intuitions, assisted by his reasoning powers and by severe purgatorial discipline protracted through countless previous births in every variety of bodily form."

Buddha lays down the universal principle that to break the link in the chain of countless transmigrations it is necessary to root out all desires, kill all affections, break all bonds that connect the individual with persons whoever they may be, whether mother, wife or child, and with things whatever they may be.* One step further the system proceeds: it maintains that in order to extinguish desire a person must resolve himself into inaction; and inaction involves on the one hand total separation from all objects external to the individual, and on the other hand an absolute introversion of thought; his mind must be turned in upon himself, and he must think upon himself so intensely from hour to hour, from day to day, from week to week, that in process of time he meditates so profoundly as to think about nothing whatever. Thought itself ceases.

Gautama proceeds on the Brahmanical principle that action has a self-perpetuating force. Every man's destiny is *entirely* dependent on his own acts. Even against his will he is forced

* He taught that if a monk should happen to see his mother in danger of drowning, he should not attempt to save her. The act might strengthen interest in and affection for his mother, and so strengthen the bond of connection as to increase the possibility of continuous individual existence by rebirths.

on from one body to another body by his former works. "As from a lump of clay a workman makes what he pleases, even so a man obtains whatever destiny he has wrought out for himself." Destiny means another form of existence in some animal, or in a god, or in a demon, but a form, whatever it may be, that continues only for an age or a term of years, and is to be followed by another higher or lower form according to the degree of merit or demerit which he may possess.

The only creator recognized by true Buddhists is Act-force. It is said: "My action is the womb that bears me." "It is Act-force that creates worlds. It is Act-force, in conjunction with Upādāna, that is, 'clinging to existence,' that creates all beings in any of the six classes into which they are divided: namely, gods, men, demons, animals, ghosts and the dwellers in hell. It is the Act-force which, according to Buddhism, resists death."

Buddha claims that he has discovered the secret of annulling this Act-force; and thus he overcomes and extinguishes the possibility of the otherwise inevitable and interminable transmigration of the soul by rebirths. To be rescued from this Act-force, and thereby to extinguish the possibility of repeated individual existence is salvation. Salvation is deliverance from the everlasting miseries of the endless transmigration of souls, and the only possible deliverance consists in the extinction of individual existence. Says Monier-Williams: The doctrine is that 'existence of all kinds involves suffering, and that such suffering can only be got rid of by self-restraint and the extinction of desires, especially the desire for the continuity of personal existence. Whatever may be said of the Christian-like self-renunciation enjoined by the Buddhist code of morality, it remains that the only self Buddhism aims at renouncing is the self of personality, and the chief self-love Buddhism deprecates is the self-love which consists in craving for continuous individual life.'

According to this broad general doctrine the Buddha propounds *four Noble Truths:* 1. All existence, in any form,

whether on earth or in heavenly spheres, necessarily involves pain and suffering. 2. All suffering is caused by lust or craving or desire, which is of three kinds: desire for sensual pleasure, for wealth, and for existence. 3. Cessation of suffering is simultaneous with extinction of lust, craving and desire. 4. Extinction of desire and cessation of suffering is accomplished by perseverance in the noble eight-fold path.

The noble eight-fold path consists (1) in right belief, which means believing in the Buddha and in his doctrine; (2) in the right resolve, which means abandoning one's wife and family; (3) in right speech, which is the recitation of the Buddha's doctrine; (4) in right work, which is the work of a monk; (5) in a right livelihood, which is living by alms as a monk does; (6) in right exercise, which is suppression of the individual self; (7) in right mindfulness, which is keeping in mind the impurities and impermanence of the body; and (8) in right mental concentration, which is trance-like quietude. By these methods the Buddhist may attain to Nirvana, the absolute extinction of all desires.

Buddha's view of life as mere suffering may be seen from a sermon addressed to his monks. The following is an extract: "Birth is suffering. Decay is suffering. Illness is suffering. Association with objects we hate is suffering. Separation from objects we love is suffering. Not to obtain what we desire is suffering. Clinging to the five elements of existence is suffering. These five elements are, the organized body; sensation of the eye, ear, nose, tongue, skin, and mind; perception of ideas; the aggregate of mental tendencies, forming individual character, derived from previous existences; and consciousness or thought. Complete cessation of thirst and of desires is cessation of suffering. This is the noble truth of suffering."

All kinds of suffering the Buddha referred to *one* cause. That cause is *ignorance;* and ignorance is the want of knowledge of the four Noble Truths which I have just quoted. Ignorance of these truths precedes lust, the primary cause of the miseries of human life.

From the representation I have given of the leading features of Buddhism, as originally taught by the Buddha, we

may infer its practical effect on social life. The paramount aim of the system "was to convince others that to get rid of ignorance, to gain knowledge, and obtain deliverance from unending rebirths, it was incumbent on a wise man to renounce married life and become a member of a monastic order." Pure Buddhism was pure monachism, including celibacy, poverty, and mendicancy. To maintain a monastic order it was necessary to enact certain rules for discipline and outward conduct. To these let us give a little attention.

The rules adopted by the Buddha were a modification of the rules for two religious orders in Brahmanism, and covered the entire personal life of the monks. For example, the *resources* of the monks were four: 1. Broken morsels given in alms for food; 2. Rags from a dust heap for clothes; 3. Roots of trees for an abode; 4. Liquid putrefying excreta of cows for medicine. In practice, however, indulgences in all four cases were allowed.

The chief *prohibitions* were also four: 1. Unchastity; 2. Taking anything not given, even a blade of grass; 3. Killing any living thing, even an ant, or worm, or plant; 4. Falsely claiming the extraordinary powers of a perfect saint.

The following practices were also incumbent on all monks:

1. "The wearing vestments given by laymen (not purchased) and consisting of three lengths of yellow-colored rags; or, if entire lengths of cotton cloth were given, the saleable value had to be destroyed by tearing them into at least three pieces, and then sewing them together:

2. "The owning no possessions except three cloths, a girdle, a bowl, razor, needle, and water-strainer to prevent the swallowing of animalculæ:

3. "The living only on food collected in a wooden bowl by daily going from house to house, but without ever asking for it:

4. "The eating at mid-day the one meal so collected and at no other time:

5. "The fasting on four prescribed days:

6. "The abiding in one spot for three or four months during Vassa, 'the rains' (from middle of June to middle of October),

when itineration would involve trampling on vegetable and insect life:

7. "The refraining from a recumbent posture under all circumstances:

8. "The visiting cremation-grounds for meditation on the corruption of the body."

The Buddhist monk submitted to the most stringent regulations in waking and sleeping, in dressing and undressing, in standing and sitting, in going out and coming in, in fasting and eating, in speaking and not speaking.

Let us remember that the genuine Buddhist was a monk who lived strictly according to the rules of the order. Monachism was the very pith and marrow of Buddhism.

According to the Buddha women had a very hard time of it. There was no salvation for a woman. At first all women were excluded from his order; but in time he yielded to the justice of the plea for women's rights. He allowed women to become nuns, and put them under the direction of monks. But the only hope of a woman was that by rigidly observing the obligations of a nun she would store up enough merit to become worthy of being reborn and transformed into the individuality of a man; then by strictly observing the rules of a monk she might have the hope of Nirvana.

Nirvana and Pari-Nirvana are to be distinguished. Nirvana was attainable during natural life. It consists in the extinction of all craving, all desire, especially the desire for continuity of existence. The Buddha by inaction, by intense and long-continued meditation and by the rigid observance of the rules prescribed for the monks attained to this state. But previously he had passed through 550 births, all of which came to his knowledge by meditation. The noteworthy point about the repeated births of Gautama Buddha, as Monier-Williams remarks, is that there appears to have been no rise from lower to higher forms; but a mere jumble of metamorphoses. We find him born four times as Mahā-brahma, twenty times as Indra, once as a hare, eighty-three times as an ascetic, fifty-eight

times as a king, twenty-four times as a Brahman, once as a gamester, eighteen times as a monkey, six times as an elephant, eleven times as a deer, once as a dog, four times as a serpent, six times as a snipe, once as a frog, twice as a fish, four times as a tree god, *twice* as a pig, ten times as a lion, four times as a cock, twice as a thief, *once* as a devil-dancer, and so on. In these previous forms of existence he did many worthy deeds. For example: Gautama gives an account of his birth as a hare. He says he was a hare living in a forest. He ate grass and did no one any harm. The thought came to him: Suppose a worthy object of charity passes by, what can I give him? I live on grass only; I cannot offer a starving man grass; I must give him myself. Then a Brahman came by. Gautama, the hare, said to him: Collect wood, place it in a heap and kindle a fire. The Brahman did so. The hare leaped into the midst of the blazing fire, and was roasted; then the Brahman ate the roasted hare. On another occasion he cut his own body to pieces to redeem a dove from a hawk. By such acts of self-sacrifice in previous forms of existence he acquired enough merit to be reborn finally as Gautama. Then as Gautama Buddha he becamo worthy of Nirvana—that is the total cessation of the desire for existence. Gautama had been preceded by twenty-four Buddhas, who were to previous ages of the world what he was to the present.

At his death Gautama attained to the blessedness of Pari-Nirvana. What is that? It is none other than the total cessation of *individual existence*. The utter cessation of desire for existence issues finally in extinction. All thought, all power of thought ceases. It ceases absolutely. There is no longer the possibility of another birth. The process of transformation from age to age is abolished. This is the blessedness of Pari-Nirvana.

The Nirvana of Brahmanism and the Pari-Nirvana of Buddhism differ. In Brahmanism the devotee by ascetic practices gains enough merit to be worthy at death of losing his individuality; he loses it by absorption into deity; deity being the

universal Essence. But absorption into deity does not necessarily end the miseries of existence. Emanations are unceasingly going forth from deity; new souls, new formations are ever reappearing. The individual man absorbed into deity may in the process of the ages be again individualized; and then he will again pass through an endless succession of births and re-births.

The Pari-Nirvana of Buddhism annihilates the possibility of a re-birth. The cessation of individual existence is not absorption of the individual into Brahm or deity, but it is the extinction of the individual. The possibility of transformation ceases because there is no longer any thing or subject to be born or reborn. The blessedness of Pari-Nirvana is the blessing of annihilation, or the utter exhaustion and the ceasing to be of any positive individual living thing.

The aim of this paper has been only to present some prominent features of original Buddhism. In order not to go beyond its intended length, a number of salient points have to be omitted, especially the difference between original Buddhism as taught by Gautama and modern Buddhism, also the difference between theoretic Buddhism and practical Buddhism. In process of time there has been a recoil. The innate instinct of worship has asserted itself in manifold forms of idolatry. Innumerable images of the Buddha are the objects of devotion wherever Buddhism is now the reigning belief. What was originally a system of pessimistic philosophy, has in spite of all its contrary hypotheses, become a religion, or a mongrel system of philosophy and religion.

I shall close by stating a few of the points of resemblance and of the many points of difference between Buddhism and Christianity.

There is a remarkable resemblance between Buddhism and Christianity as to some of its ethical precepts.

Buddhism says: do not love the world, do not love money, hate not your enemies, do no unrighteous acts, commit no impurities, overcome evil with good, and do to others as you desire them to do to you. But the end of such precepts is not to develop and mature an ideal personal life, but to detach the

Buddhist from all objects, and so break the power of the law of individual being. Of the one the aim is the blessedness of conscious and free existence of man in a state of perfection; of the other the aim is to render the conscious existence of the individual man after death an impossibility. For a fundamental maxim of Buddhism is, that human life is not worth living, neither on earth, nor in hell, nor in heaven.

There is a remarkable resemblance, also, between Buddhist asceticism and the ascetic practices of the Greek Catholic and Roman Catholic Churches. But the resemblance of penances, of self-imposed bodily mortifications, is only outward. As to the principle, spirit, and ultimate aim the difference is world-wide.

The one thing in which Buddhism is perhaps most really akin to Christianity is its universality. Buddhism sets aside all the distinctions of caste. All classes of the lowest no less than the highest people were admitted to the Order of Gautama by which true enlightenment may be obtained. Even animals were not excluded.

A story is told of five hundred bats that lived in a cave where two monks daily recited the law. These bats gained such merit by simply hearing the sound that when they died they were all re-born as men and ultimately as gods. Then they were on a fair way of at length reaching Pari-Nirvana. Woman seems to have had more difficulty in being admitted to the blessings of Buddhism than the bats.

Some of the striking points of difference are the following:

Christianity believes in one Supreme Being, the one personal God, from whom proceedeth all the temporal and spiritual good. Buddhism knows no personal God who is supreme. It has gods as well as demons; but a Buddhist monk, an Arhat, may have more merit than a Buddhist god. Gods and demons are only higher and lower forms in the everlasting process of transformation. Gautama Buddha was above the gods.

Christianity reveals the truth that the one personal God is the Creator and Former of the universe. The world has come into existence by virtue of His originative will. Buddhism

honors mighty deities, but they are not held to be the creators of the world in the Christian sense. They are merely Supreme Rulers outside and above it; for Northern Buddhists agree with Southern that the world exists of itself, and its only Creator is the force of its own acts.

Christianity is the self-manifestation of God in Jesus Christ. It claims to be the Truth by which all men may attain to godlike wisdom and godlike righteousness. Buddha believes in no God who is supreme over all things, who is the only source of wisdom, and therefore he cannot recognize a revelation. He needs no revelation. Buddha turns to himself alone. The last words spoken by him to his monks before his death are these: "I am now grown old; I have reached eighty years; just as a worn-out cart can only with much care be made to move along, so my body can only be kept going with difficulty. In future be ye to yourselves your own light, your own refuge; seek no other refuge. Look not to any one but yourselves as a refuge. Behold now, O monks, I exhort you: everything that cometh into being passeth away. Work out your own perfection with diligence."

Christianity provides a personal Saviour; Jesus Christ makes atonement for sin; He delivers all who believe in Him from sin and death. Buddha does not profess to be a saviour. The only person he can save is himself. All he professes to do consists in imparting to men the knowledge of the method by which every man may save himself; and that salvation is, not eternal life, not deliverance from sin, but emancipation from the miseries of life by the cessation of personal existence.

Christianity is the firm foundation of the hope that all the members of Christ will overcome death and attain to the blessedness of eternal life; that eternal life is the positive perfection of personality in the communion of unchanging love with the personal God in the realm of His own glory. Buddhism also teaches a heaven, a lower and a higher heaven. But the Buddhist heaven is deliverance from the ever on-going wheel of transmigration. And the perfection of that deliverance is none

other than self-annihilation. The life of man, like a candle, is blown out; and the consequence is the blessing of nothingness.

I shall name but one more of many remarkable differences. Buddhism, like all pagan philosophy and nearly all ethnic religions, sets its iron heel on the neck of woman. Woman as woman is hopeless. There is nothing before her but the transmigration of her soul from age to age. The only chance she has is the possible transformation into a man. Christianity, on the contrary, recognizes woman as a personal being. From Genesis to Revelation the Word of God puts her personality on a level with the personality of man. Like man she is formed in God's image. Like man she shares the new birth of the Holy Spirit of Christ and the forgiveness of sins from God. Christianity is the religion that honors my mother, my sister, my wife, my daughter as my equal.

The contrast between Buddhism and Christianity is a vast, profound, yea an impassable gulf. When the two systems are thoroughly studied it becomes evident that there are no affinities whatever, between the religion of Christianity and the philosophy of Gautama.

Gautama was a man naturally of noble spirit. He had a deep sense of the vanity and misery of human life. He cherished lively sympathies with men; he spent forty-five years in the endeavor to save them from interminable sufferings. But to accomplish his purpose he set himself against man; he crushed every social relation; he went counter to all the nobler instincts of the soul; he turned away from God, and arrayed himself against himself. His system, notwithstanding its many noble sentiments, may justly be styled to be a system of physical, mental and moral suicide.

III.

SAMUEL GULDIN, PIETIST AND PIONEER.*

BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, D.D.,

It is pleasant to put on record the following facts concerning the personal history of Samuel Guldin, one of the earliest ministers of the Reformed Church in the United States. Though his descendants have preserved a tradition that he was a Swiss minister who, in some unexplained way, had suffered persecution, the particulars of his eventful career appear to have been entirely forgotten. He is ignored by earlier writers, such as Mayer, Harbaugh and Heisler; and in the "Historic Manual"

*Authorities—*Guldin's Works.*—1. Kurtze Apologie oder Schutz-Schrifft der unschuldig verdächtig-gemachten und verworffenen Pietisten zu Bern in Schweitz: in sich haltend.

1. Die wider sie gethane Relation der Commission vor einer hohen Oberkeit daselbst, so geschehen den 9 Junii, 1699.

2. Die Apologie oder Schutz-Schrifft dagegen aufgesetzt und ans Licht gegeben von Samuel Güldin, gewesenen Prediger und Diacono in allen dreyen Haupt-Kirchen daselbst. Gedruckt in Philadelphia im Jahr Christi 1718.

II. Kurtze Lehr und Gegensätze zu Erläuterung und Rettung der Göttlichen Wahrheit, von Samuel Guldin. Philadelphia, 1718.

III. Samuel Güldin's, gewesenen Predigers in den Drey Haupt-Kirchen zu Bern in der Schweitz, Sein unpartheyisches zeugnüss uber die neue Vereinigung aller Religions-Partheyen in Pennsylvania. Gedruckt bey Christoph Saur in Germantown, 1743.

Max Goebel's "Geschichte des Christlichen Lebens;" I. D. Rupp's "History of Berks and Lebanon Counties," etc.

The writer also expresses his obligations to Drs. E. Bloesch and Herman Escher, of Switzerland, for the examination of original records; and to the Hon. Samuel W. Pennypacker, LL.D., of Philadelphia; the Rev. Isaac S. Stahr, of Oley; and the Rev. James G. Dengler, of Sellersville, for information concerning the American history of Samuel Guldin and his descendants.

of the Reformed Church, published by the writer in 1885, it is merely stated, on the ground of the family tradition, that he was "a Swiss minister who settled in Pennsylvania early in the last century, probably independent." In the preface to the Discourse commemorative of the services of the Rev. John C. Guldin, D.D., of New York, preached in 1868 by the Rev. Isaac Ferris, D.D., it is said that Dr. Guldin's "great-grandfather came to this country over a hundred years ago, from Berne, Switzerland, and settled in Pennsylvania, where the family have become numerous." Having enjoyed the personal acquaintance of the late Dr. Guldin, and of many other members of the family, we venture to say that the above was nearly all that they certainly knew concerning their distinguished ancestor.

The attention of the writer was first attracted to this subject by observing the statement, in Hildeburn's "Issues of the Pennsylvania Press," that Samuel Guldin published, in 1743, a small volume concerning the union of all the churches in Pennsylvania, as proposed by Count Zinzendorf. Of this book but a single copy is known to exist; and it is of course highly valued by its owner, the Hon. S. W. Pennypacker, of Philadelphia. On the title-page its author is styled "late preacher in the three principal churches of Berne, in Switzerland." Here, then, was a clew which deserved to be carefully followed. If Guldin had occupied so prominent a position, it was evident that he must have left traces in local history; and the writer accordingly addressed notes of inquiry to several gentlemen in Switzerland who were supposed to be most likely to be able to supply the desired information. As a result of this correspondence we have not only secured some interesting information concerning the early life of our Pennsylvania pioneer, but have also received as a gift a copy of Guldin's "Apologie," a book of extreme rarity, containing the charges made against him at his trial for Pietism, as well as his spirited defense against these accusations.

Samuel Guldin, or Gueldin, was born, in 1660, in the city of

Berne, Switzerland. His father, Joachim Guldin, was a native of the canton of St. Gall, and had removed to Berne, in 1633. The son was well educated at Berne, and subsequently visited foreign universities. He himself tells us that he studied at Geneva and Lausanne, and afterwards, in company with several Swiss fellow-students, spent some time in Germany and Holland.

It was at Geneva that an event occurred which was to Guldin the beginning of a higher and better life. He himself described it when, at a later date, he was accused of having become a Pietist in Germany, in the following words: "If you insist on knowing the origin of our so-called *Pietism*, it is as follows: There were four of us who resolved to make a journey from Berne to Geneva. We determined above all things to make it *a Christian journey*, to avoid the quarrels which are common among students, and to gather heavenly treasure. At Geneva Mr. Lutz became ill, and during his illness he was not alone brought to a profound knowledge of his spiritual condition, but all of us, who before could not agree, became so united in spirit that we ever afterwards remained faithful to each other. And this happened in Geneva, *in sede Calvini*. Then we journeyed together to Lausanne, and thereafter met daily in the morning and evening for the worship of God."

With a certain grim humor Guldin excuses his German teachers from any attempt to influence him in favor of Pietism. He says, "They did not know anything about it." This is probable, for we know that German theology had become fossilized, and religious worship was official and mechanical in the last degree. As Spener said: "The old scholastic theology, which Luther had thrown out of the front door, had returned the back way and taken its ancient position."*

It is not, however, to be supposed that Guldin remained uninfluenced by the Pietism of Germany. It was the period of Spener's greatest activity, and from Strasburg to Dresden the whole community was moved. If the theologians knew nothing

* Max Goebel's "Geschichte," II, 569.

about Pietism, the people certainly felt its presence. They may not have known it by name, but the power of a new life was felt through all the land.

Ritschl maintains that though Spener is justly called "the father of Pietism," he was "himself not a Pietist;" and it is certain that few of the errors and none of the extravagances of the movement can be ascribed to him. Personally he might have been called, like Annoni of Basel, "the pastor after God's own heart." He had no quarrel with the orthodoxy of his time, but his intense earnestness, and the discipline which he enforced could not fail to produce results beyond the lines which he had originally laid down. Sectarians of all kinds felt encouraged to utter their protests against the established churches. Mystics propounded strange doctrines and prophesied the speedy consummation of all things. From all of these enthusiasts arose a cry: "Come ye forth out of Babel."

The position of the Pietists who adhered to the established churches was by no means enviable. They stood between two fires, and were likely to be singed by both. Though their sole purpose was to revive the ancient churches in accordance with the spirit of the gospel, they were charged with heresy, and often most unjustly persecuted and condemned. On the other hand, fanatics accused them of lacking courage to express their convictions. Repudiated by the orthodox zealots of the Church, they were, of course, in constant danger of falling into the extravagancies of the mystics.

While we do not doubt that Guldin was unconsciously influenced by what he heard and read in Germany, it is certain that his Pietism was of a very mild type, which in some places might have passed unchallenged. It was his misfortune to be brought into collision with a government which, in its pride of orthodoxy, was narrow-minded, bigoted and merciless.

Guldin appears to have returned to Switzerland in 1691,—the very year in which the Pietists of Germany founded the University of Halle. In August, 1692, he became pastor of the church at Stettlen, a village a league from Berne. He was

no doubt married when he entered upon his charge, and on the 8th of November, 1693, his eldest son, Samuel, was born. As a preacher he immediately attracted unusual attention, and his church was always crowded. His sermons were not constructed after the prescribed scholastic form, and were therefore obnoxious to sticklers for antiquity; but their freshness and enthusiasm rendered them unusually acceptable to the people. There were many *crypto*-Pietists in the neighborhood, and these rejoiced to have found a pastor after their own heart. Under their influence certain phenomena appeared in the congregation, which are described as similar to those from which the Quakers had derived their name. During religious service the people trembled, and sometimes fell into convulsions. Guldin was never accused of having induced or promoted these phenomena; but one of the most serious charges brought against him was that he had not labored to prevent them.

It so happened that the young men who had been Guldin's fellow-students at Geneva—Koenig, Lutz and Schumacher—had also been appointed to pastoral charges in the canton or city of Berne. They remained his intimate friends and coadjutors, and finally became his companions in suffering and persecution.

For nine months, Guldin tells us in his "Apologie," he was dissatisfied with his position. Though his earlier religious experience had been sufficiently decided, he could not enter fully into the spirit of the place. He had made up his mind to retire, and supposed he had preached his last sermon, when, as he says, "on the 4th of August, 1693, between nine and ten o'clock in the forenoon, the light of faith arose, and was born within me. In that hour all my difficulties and scruples disappeared, so that I was never afterwards affected by them; and I began to preach with new power, so that my whole congregation became aware that a change had taken place in my soul."

Guldin's reputation as a preacher increased rapidly, and on the 26th of December, 1796, he was elected *diaconus*, or, as

we should now say, associate pastor of the *minster*, the principal church of the neighboring city of Berne. This was regarded as a great triumph by his friends; and on the same day Lutz wrote the following playful, but imprudent letter: "Golden tidings! This day our *golden* brother, Guldin, was elected *diaconus* by a majority of the votes of the Council. Glory to God who doeth wonders! May He anoint the man whom He has ordained! How will it sound in the ears of our enemies? The 'arch-sectarian' is now a city pastor and member of the Ministerium and Council. Thus the stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner. Inform the brethren, so that they may praise God and help us to contend for the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ." This letter unfortunately fell into the hands of the authorities, and was the cause of much trouble.

For more than two years Guldin continued his labors in the minster, preaching also in his turn in the other churches of the city. His popularity increased, and the party which gathered around him became numerous, compact and aggressive. Guldin appears to have been more prudent than his coadjutors; for with all that his enemies could do, it was not proved that he had spoken disrespectfully of dignities. His friend, Koenig, was bolder, and on several occasions sharply criticized the government. The old orthodox party was alarmed, and Guldin, Koenig and Lutz were cited to appear before the Great Council of the canton. Schumacher would no doubt have been included in the citation if he had not suddenly died just before it was issued. The trial was long and tedious; but the result was from the beginning a foregone conclusion. It was not so much certain individuals as Pietism itself that was put on trial; and it was the evident purpose of the party in power to crush the movement at all hazards. The trial was brought to a conclusion on the 9th of June, 1699, by the condemnation of all the parties accused.

It was not until 1718 that Guldin published his "Apology for the unjustly suspected Pietists of Berne." According to the

imprint on the title-page it appeared in Philadelphia, but it is certain that it was not printed in this country. There was no German press in America at that early date. The imprint evidently means that this work, as well as the one which immediately succeeded it, was issued under the auspices of one of the Philadelphian societies, composed of Pietists, which at that time existed in Germany. The place of publication was somewhere in the Rhine country; but it was not desirable that the exact locality should be mentioned, as such publications were regarded as seditious, and were forbidden under heavy penalties.

In his "Apologie" Guldin wisely includes the indictment that was brought against him and his companions, together with the judgment of the court; and then, in a second part, presents his defense, which, from our present point of view, is keen and convincing. Of course, we do not agree with him in what may be called the distinctive features of his Pietism; but to convince the modern reader of the weakness, not to say the positive injustice, of most of the charges, it might have been enough to publish the indictment without note or comment.

To reproduce this verbose legal document, which is called the *Relation*, would be tedious in the extreme. It is composed in the so-called "chancery language" of the times, and is full of legal phrases and repetitions. The charges are supported by numerous specifications, which, however, consist chiefly of insignificant matters, or even of the irresponsible utterances of persons who were not on trial. By way of introduction we have a glorification of Berne for its faithfulness to the doctrines of the Reformation. It is declared to have preserved the truth more perfectly than other Reformed cities, so that Berne is everywhere regarded as a monument of the faith. Now, alas! evil days have come. Pietism has made its way into this happy community, and designing men threaten to subvert the foundations of social order.

The history of the Pietistic movement in Berne is given at length. It is represented as having begun with the "foolish dreams" of a weak-minded woman, and as having been encour-

aged by emissaries from Germany. Finally Guldin and his coadjutors appear on the scene, and for them there is a long list of accusations, each one of which, it was held, was sufficient to secure their condemnation. These charges are grouped under the following heads:

1. *The circulation of improper books.* Books of this kind are classified as heterodox, seditious, fanatical and mystical. As might be expected, they include the writings of Weigel, Poiret, Jane Leade, and the works of the shoemaker, Jacob Boehme, "which," it is said, "no sensible man can understand." The principal charge against Guldin in this connection is that he accepted some of these books as a gift, and did not warn the people against them.

2. *Errors of doctrine.* Certain of the accused asserted that a regenerated person cannot sin; that a Christian may attain to a condition in which all his prayers are thanksgivings, so that his whole life becomes a prayer, and it is not necessary that his devotion should be expressed in words. They also asserted that a man who feels himself to be a sinner should not venture to receive the Lord's Supper. In a sermon on the ministry Guldin had asserted: "A true prophet needs an internal call, by which he not only recognizes and teaches the truth in an external way, but is spiritually illuminated and sanctified." In the same connection he had said: "A man may be regularly ordained and yet be a false prophet, if he has not received an internal call." In a letter to Mr. Laub, July 10, 1697, he wrote: "God has in this place testified to the doctrine of faith by all kinds of signs and wonders, and by the manifest opposition of the world."

3. *Chiliasm.* The accused pastors announced the speedy coming of the millennium—"a doctrine on which theologians are not agreed, and which has not been preached in Switzerland since the days of the Reformation. It is contrary to the Helvetic Confession, and was the favorite theme of John of Leyden and other enthusiasts."

4. *Unmethodical Preaching.* The accused expressed themselves contemptuously with regard to the logical method of

preaching which is taught in the schools. They also occasionally preached in the dialect of the people, which was "not only in bad taste, but actually detracted from the dignity of the service." Instead of instructing their catechumens in the usual manner, by questions and answers, they lectured and exhorted.

5. *Crowding the Churches.* Wherever the accused preached they were followed by a great multitude of people. Especially when "a certain one of their number" preached a large number of country folks attended divine service in the city. "This was subversive of proper discipline, and the Sabbath was thereby profaned. Faithful pastors were brought into disrepute, and their feelings greatly embittered." Guldin and others made no attempt to prevent the gathering of these crowds, but rather seemed to glory in them.

6. *Concerning Trembling.* "Among the disorders recently introduced," says the *Relation*, "is the so-called *Trembling*, which is a peculiarly offensive thing, founded neither on the word of God nor on the proper customs of the Church, closely resembling the quaking of the Quakers in England, and hitherto unknown in our churches since the time of the blessed Reformation." Mr. Guldin, even after the authorities had expressed their disapproval, preached a sermon on the text: "Judge not!" in which he expressed a doubt whether Trembling was the work of God or of Satan. "He ought to have supported the government; otherwise to have kept silent."

7. *Concerning Conventicles.* Meetings had been held without authority, at which psalms were sung and religious subjects considered. On one occasion Anabaptists were present. There was no special charge against Guldin in this connection.

8. *Correspondence with Foreign Pietists.* On this point much material is presented, but most of it is entirely irrelevant. Expressions made in the freedom of private correspondence are tortured and twisted until they are made to convey more than the writers intended. Guldin is, for instance, charged with having written to Laub, March 21, 1698: "Here everything is advancing—there are buds on the vine and shoots on the trees—

ah! who can tell what the fruit will be?" How these words could have been regarded as seriously objectionable it is hard to understand.

The *Relation* occupies thirty pages, concluding with direful prophecies as to the result if the Pietists are suffered to escape unpunished. In our brief sketch of its contents we have followed as nearly as possible the argument of the original. Its weakness is apparent at a glance, and yet it is evident that the parties occupied positions which were decidedly antagonistic. The harsh, traditional orthodoxy of the Council is, to say the least, offensive; while on the other hand the new-born zeal of the Pietists was in danger of leading them into the wildest extravagancies.

Guldin's *Apologie* is long and argumentative. It covers thirty-eight pages and is in great part a plea for "experimental religion." In his introduction he attempts to make it appear that the Reformation of the sixteenth century remained incomplete, and that the time had now come for a great advance. He attempts to prick the bubble of the vanity of the Council by telling them that in foreign countries their orthodoxy is not so highly esteemed as they imagine; and even suggests that they have an account to settle for their merciless persecution of the Anabaptists. Taking up the charges of his accusers *seriatim*, he answers them at length, in most instances acknowledging the facts, but denying the inferences. He says he has never read the works of Jane Leade;* but charges the Council with ignorance for forbidding the people to read the writings of Tauler, which Luther loved. As a minister he claims the privilege of reading whatever he deems proper, and pertinently inquires how he could be expected to refute errors without first becoming acquainted with them. "The Bible says: 'Prove all things;' it does not say: 'Forbid the people to read.'"

The *Apologie* was probably written long after the trial, and was rather an argument for Pietism than a personal defense.

* Jane Leade (1623–1704) founded the Philadelphian Society of London. She was a disciple of Boehme and an extreme Chiliast and Separatist.

The writer denies that the peculiarities of the Pietists are errors; and even insists, on what seem to be insufficient grounds, that their teachings are in full accord with the Heidelberg Catechism and the decrees of the Synod of Berne. He asserts that the doctrine that the regenerate do not commit sin is entirely Scriptural "when properly understood;" but repudiates the charge that Pietists believe that those who are fully sanctified need not pray. Lay-preaching and "conventicles" are justified on the ground of Scriptural prophecy. The peculiar phenomena of Pietism are represented as analogous to the struggles which accompanied the healing of the demoniacs; they are the vain efforts of the evil spirit to retain its ascendancy over the soul which Christ has come to deliver.

The reader who is at all familiar with Pietism, either in its earlier or later form, can have no difficulty in anticipating the course of the arguments. As we read the *Apologie* we feel that the castigation there administered to the authorities of Berne is most thoroughly deserved. We have no sympathy with the narrow-mindedness of men who in a great religious movement were utterly unable to discriminate between its good and evil elements. Their charges, as stated in the *Relation*, were generally trifling, not to say contemptible. On the other hand, the *Apologie* shows us that the accused were not willing to yield an inch to their prosecutors. They were Pietists and gloried in it. Under such circumstances compromise could hardly have been thought of; and the trial resulted in the condemnation of the accused.

In the judgment of the council Chaplain Koenig was the chief offender, having spoken disrespectfully of the government. He was accordingly deposed from the ministry and banished from the country. In the cases of Guldin and Lutz the judgment was a little less severe. They were deprived of their pastoral charges and forbidden to teach, either in public or private, or to attend "conventicles," under penalty of deposition from the ministry. If they should agree to renounce Pietism, and to submit to the Helvetic Confessions and the decrees of the Coun-

cil, they might, at the pleasure of the authorities, "be appointed to positions inferior to those which they had hitherto occupied, and as far distant as possible from the city of Berne."

In accordance with this decree, Guldin was conditionally offered an obscure parish in the mountains; but he refused to accept the conditions, and very naturally expressed himself with some freedom concerning the court and its decrees. He was accordingly arrested and imprisoned. How long this imprisonment continued we have not been able to ascertain; but we are informed that on his release he lived for some time in retirement in a village near Berne.* A MS. note by an unknown hand, on our copy of the *Apologie*, states that Guldin was, in 1708, appointed pastor "in der Lengg,"† but was removed the same year, "and then emigrated to Pennsylvania." Our Swiss correspondent is, however, probably more accurate when he says that "he resided for some time in Germany before he removed to America." On this portion of his history we have no information. If Guldin came to this country in 1708 he was by far the earliest Reformed minister in Pennsylvania. It is, however, much more natural to suppose that he remained in Germany until after 1718, publishing his books in defense of the Pietists as a "parting shot." There are no consecutive lists of immigrants prior to 1727, and the date of his arrival cannot, therefore, be accurately determined. It may, however, be assumed that he was accompanied by his family; and as an old Family Bible, now in possession of his descendant, Reuben W. Guldin, explicitly states that his son Samuel was married in May, 1722, and his eldest grandson born in July, 1723, the family must have arrived at an earlier date—these events being known to have occurred in Pennsylvania.‡ We therefore tentatively place

* Letter from Dr. Bloesch, Jan. 21, 1892.

† Possibly Lengnau, 17 miles from Berne.

‡ It may be interesting to some of our readers to indicate the line of descent between the Rev. Samuel Guldin, and the late Rev. John C. Guldin, D.D., of New York. The following are the successive generations: 1. Rev. Samuel Guldin, born 1660; 2. Samuel Guldin, *Junior*, born Nov. 8, 1693; 3. Daniel Guldin, born April 20, 1735; 4. John Guldin, born Oct. 18, 1770; 5. John C. Guldin, born August, 1799.

the date of the arrival of the family between 1718 and 1722, with the probabilities in favor of 1719. Even these dates indicate that Guldin was the earliest ordained Reformed minister in Pennsylvania. Boehm did not begin to preach until 1720, and was ordained in 1729. Weiss arrived in Philadelphia in 1727.

When Guldin arrived in Oley—now in Berks county—he must have been greeted by sympathizing friends. The region is exceedingly fertile, and was accordingly occupied much earlier than the surrounding country. Many of the early settlers were of Huguenot descent, and had brought with them much of the mysticism which was characteristic of French Protestantism in the latter part of the 18th century. There were also many German Pietists, and it is not too much to say that the whole community was for some time greatly influenced by their teachings. "Oley township," says Rupp,* "was remarkable as a place for religious excitement, at an early period. A singular sect was started there, headed by one Matthias Bowman." "Bowman's followers professed sinless perfection—boasting that they were sent of God to conform others. They called themselves '*New Born.*'" With such surroundings, it is hardly likely that Guldin felt himself a stranger.

The name of Samuel Guldin appears frequently in early records as a purchaser or owner of lands. In 1729 he became a naturalized subject of the king of Great Britain. An insurmountable difficulty in these instances is found in the fact that father and son bore precisely the same name, so that it becomes impossible to distinguish between them.

It is known that Samuel Guldin took up 200 acres of land and paid for them. The land was well chosen, and is now divided into several excellent farms. The family tradition describes him as a successful and enterprising farmer—a pioneer in the best sense of the word. He is also said to have preached frequently and acceptably, and to have administered the sacraments, though without a regular charge. This tradition we believe to be reliable; for apart from the fact that when Guldin arrived in

* History of Berks and Lebanon counties, p. 233.

this country there were no Reformed churches which might have claimed his services, his recollections of the established Church of Switzerland were hardly of such a nature as to render him enthusiastic for its foundation in America. As he was known to be a minister he was, no doubt, often requested to preach, especially at funerals, and to administer the sacraments. The community in which he lived was not at first sufficiently harmonious in religious matters to unite in building a church; and Rupp says, on the authority of Loskiel, that as late as 1742, there was no church in Oley.* Schlatter mentions the church of Oley† as existing in 1751;‡ but as he does not include it in his list of organized charges, it seems probable that it had been recently founded. As Guldin died before Schlatter's arrival in this country his name does not appear in the "Journal."

For many years Guldin was chiefly occupied as a farmer; but there is evidence to show that he was profoundly interested in the religious movements of the times. At Ephrata, in the neighboring county of Lancaster, Conrad Beissel had founded a monastic society of Seventh-Day Baptists, which was called the Order of the Solitary. In 1728 Beissel published his "Ninety-nine Mystical Sayings," one of the earliest of his publications. Concerning this publication the *Chronicon Ephratense* says: "When a learned scholar, named Gulde, saw them he traveled to him, and asked him why he had made 99 of them and not 100. His answer was, that as the number 99 was reached he was stopped in the Spirit. Then he asked him (Beissel) why he observed the Sabbath. The answer: That he had experienced that whenever the Sabbath came all his burdens, which rested on him during the week, were removed, which did not happen to him on Sundays. Against this

* History of Berks and Lebanon Counties, p. 223.

† As early as 1736 Henry Antes ministered to the Reformed people of Oley. "It is not certain that he preached at this time, but he went from house to house and led the people in singing and prayer."—"Historic Manual," p. 191.

‡ Schlatter's "Journal," p. 204.

he (Guldin) had no objections to make, and went his way edified."*

We may not implicitly trust the chronicler's report of this conversation, but it at least appears from the passage that Guldin was brought into contact with the Ephrata Brethren.

Guldin's last publication appeared in 1743. It was mainly directed against the movement for the union of all the German churches of Pennsylvania, which resulted in the organization of "The Congregation of God in the Spirit." This movement had begun in Oley, where John Adam Gruber—a member of the sect called "The Inspired"—had, as early as 1738, issued an address calling for some sort of union. The idea was taken up by Henry Antes and others, and under the patronage of Count Zinzendorf it for awhile promised to exert a powerful influence in favor of Christian unity.† Six Synods were held, composed of members of various churches, "who were able to give a reason for the faith that was in them."

As the most important of these Synods was held in Oley by men whose religious views were thoroughly "pietistic," it might be supposed that Guldin would have taken an active part in the new "congregation." On the contrary, he felt moved in his old age to protest against it, and wrote a little book which left no doubt with regard to his position. He had never been an extreme Pietist, and now, after years of reflection, he did not hesitate to warn Christians against fanaticism. He was not one of those who cried, "Come forth out of Babel!" Some of his views were still sufficiently curious, but they were mild indeed when compared with the extravagancies of some of his neighbors. He declared himself favorable to Christian unity, but insisted that Count Zinzendorf's movement was purely mechanical and intended chiefly for the aggrandizement of an individual.

Guldin's book is composed of five parts, which appear to have been originally circulated as separate tracts. The titles

* *Chronicon Ephratense*, English version, p. 43.

† "Historic Manual," p. 192.

of the several parts may be translated as follows: 1. Balm of Gilead poured on the wounds and injuries of all Religious Sects and Parties in Pennsylvania and all Christendom. 2. Concerning False Prophets; 3. Concerning the true doctrine and servants of Christ; 4. Well-meant Reflections; 5. Concerning the Conduct of James Davenport.*

The volume published by Guldin in America was in some respects inferior to his European publications. The fact may have been due to the infirmity of old age; or possibly the hand that held the plow had lost its cunning in guiding the pen; but it is evident at a glance that, for scholarship, vigor and style this book is not to be compared with the productions of his earlier years.

Christopher Saur's paper, published in Germantown Jan. 16, 1746, contains the following brief notice: "*Der sonst von vielen Jahren her bekannte Samuel Guldin ist in Philadelphia den Tag vorm neuen Jahr gestorben im 81 ten Jahr seines Alters.*" As tradition is clear in asserting that he lies buried in the family graveyard in Oley, it may, perhaps, be taken for granted that he was on a visit in Philadelphia at the time of his death, and that his body was taken home for interment. The obituary is far too short for our present purposes, but it at any rate reveals the fact that Guldin was for many years well known by his contemporaries, and fixes the date of his death as the 31st of December, 1745.

Much of what we have said is founded on the comparison of isolated facts and dates, and may be subject to revision; but the main outlines of his career have, we think, been sufficiently determined. That he remained a Pietist is evident from his latest publication; but he was not a fanatic. Carried away in his youth by a great religious movement, he remained attached

*James Davenport (1716–1757) was prominent in the revival which is known as "the great awakening." He destroyed by fire wigs, fine garments, jewels, etc., "in order to cure the people of their idolatrous love of worldly things." Guldin does not approve of his peculiarities, but pleads that he should be kindly treated on account of his evident sincerity.—Appleton's "Cyclopædia of American Biography," II, p. 84.

to its fundamental principles, but learned to avoid its extravagancies. Though he had been persecuted by orthodox bigots, he never identified himself with any one of the sectarian movements which were in his days so numerous in Pennsylvania. He brought up his children in the faith of the Reformed Church, and preached the Gospel and administered the Sacraments according to her ancient usages. By his contemporaries he was regarded as a minister whose personal character was irreproachable; and he, therefore, deserves an honorable position in the history of the church from whose standards, according to his own assertion, he never departed.

IV.

THE PENTATEUCH.

THE ARTICLE OF JULIUS WELLHAUSEN.

REVIEWED BY H. P. LAIRD, ESQ.

In the 18th Vol. of the 9th Edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, under the heading of "Pentateuch," the distinguished Professor of Oriental Literature, in the University of Halle, Julius Wellhausen, has furnished for the public at large, an exhaustive criticism on the Pentateuch; and, also, a history of the previous state of the discussion on the same subject.

He arrays against the traditional belief in the authenticity of the Pentateuch, two lines of argument: one negative, the other positive; and a large portion of the article is devoted to proving that the Pentateuch was not all written by one hand.

The whole theory of the Christian religion, the synagogue, and the Tabernacle, presupposes a divine revelation from the beginning, down to the last of the prophets.—Heb. 1st chapter, 1st verse; Luke 1st, 70th verse.

Why, then, should there not be a record of these inspired revelations down to the age of Moses?

They lose nothing by having the stamp of his inspired authority, and for us who have no other means of verifying them, than the authority of Moses, they are as really Mosaic as if every sentence they contain had been written with his own hand; and, that nothing might be wanting to induce the utmost confidence in a document authenticated by Moses, this great lawgiver, has the endorsement of the Redeemer of the world.

What more is wanting to establish the authenticity of the Pentateuch?

In the affairs of human life, ancient writings, resting on much less authority than the Mosaic record, would not be permitted to be questioned in any court of justice in Christendom.

The Roman Emperor, Justinian, appointed a commission with Tribonius at its head, to report a digest of the Roman law.

He stamped their report with his imperial authority, and repealed all earlier laws, not contained in this report; and, for more than thirteen hundred years no lawyer has been heard in any court of justice to question the verity or the authority of the laws contained in this digest of the civil law; the Roman law, thus abbreviated, was partly re-written by the commission; and, again, whole pages of the old law were copied, word for word, from the most ancient manuscripts, in the very language of the times in which it was first written.

If the history of this remarkable transaction was lost, critics of the Tübingen school could prove by linguistic comparisons, that no part of the digest was written until the age of Justinian; or, if this was found unsatisfactory, that it had all been written before the age of the Cæsars, and that the more modern Latin found in the Digest was an interpolation of a later age.

We are informed by the learned Professor, that De Wette, one of the early critics, found that the Pentateuch was not authority for the history of the time in which it was written; it is, he says, "the conditions of that much later time which the author idealizes and throws back into the past, whether in the form of narrative or of law."

The learned Professor eulogizes the performance of De Wette; but admits that he had gone too far. Whatever the ability of De Wette may have been as a critic, his conclusions were too improbable to require any refutation.

Professor Wellhausen allows Moses a place in the Pentateuch; but credits the larger portion of it to a later age.

He admits that it is referred to in 2d Chron. 25th, and 4th

and 35th, and 12th, under the designation, the "Book of Moses."

He might, also, have cited from the same book and for the same purpose, the 34th chapter and 14th verse, where it is called "a book of the law of the Lord by the hand of Moses," and verse 30th, where it is called "the book of the covenant."

It would have been fatal to the hypothesis of the learned Professor if he had admitted that Moses was referred to as the author of the Pentateuch from the days of Joshua down to the age of King Josiah; and, hence, he skillfully and with assumed candor says: "Moses is already taken for the author of the Pentateuch in 2d Chron., etc., a book which he contends was written after the exile.

Let us just here turn to some of the references which Wellhausen has purposely omitted:

Joshua 8 chap., 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35 verses;
Joshua 13 chap., 15, 21, 24, 29 and 33 verses;
Joshua 14 chap., 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 verses;
Joshua 20 chap., 1 and 2 verses;
Joshua 22 chap., 4, 5, 28 and 29 verses;
Joshua 24 chap., 26 verse;
1 Judges 3 chap., 4 verse;
1 Samuel 12 chap., 6 and 8 verses;
1 Kings 2 chap., 3 verse;
1 Kings 8 chap., 9, 53, 56 verses;
2 Kings 14 chap., 6 verse;
2 Kings 18 chap., 6 and 12 verses, and 21 chap., 8 verse.

The following quotations from Professor Wellhausen's article will disclose the conclusions he assumes to have arrived at.—Ency. Britannica, Vol. 18, page 512:

"The greater part of the narrative of the Pentateuch cannot be measured by an historical standard; but, within certain limits, that standard can be applied to the special age of Moses and Joshua. . . . .

"It is asked, for example, what is left for Moses, if he was not the author of the Torah.

"But Moses may have been the founder of the Torah, though the Pentateuchal legislation was codified, almost a thou-

sand years later; for the Torah was originally not a written law, but the oral decisions of the priests at the sanctuary—case law in short—by which they decided all manner of questions and controversies that were brought before their tribunal; their Torah was the instructions to others that came from their lips, not at all a written document in their hands, guaranteeing their own status and instructing themselves how to proceed in the sacrificial ritual. . . .

"But while it was only at a late date that the ritual appeared as Torah, as it does in the priestly code, its usages and traditions are exceedingly ancient, going back, in fact, to pre-Mosaic and heathenish times."

It will be observed that no evidence is adduced to sustain these conjectures; the learned professor, however, apparently unconscious of the fact that these statements do not rest on adequate evidence; but only on conjecture, on page 510 in the same article draws the following grave inferences:

"Hence, we conclude that the priests' code builds on the realization of the object aimed at in Deuteronomy.; and, therefore, belongs to the times after the exile when this object had been fully secured. . .

"Ezekiel's ideas and aims are entirely in the same direction as the priestly code, and yet, he plainly does not know the code itself." (A bold assumption from which the author draws his conclusions as follows:) "This can only mean that in his day it did not exist, and that his ordinances formed one of the steps that prepared the way for it. Page 514.

"This code, incorporated in the Pentateuch, and forming the narrative part of its legislation, became the definitive Mosaic law.

"As such it was published and put in action 444 B. C., by the Babylonian priest and scribe, Ezra, . . . just as we are told (2 Kings, 22 chap.) that Deuteronomy became known in 621 B. C., *having been unknown previously;* so we are told here that the Torah in the rest of the Pentateuch became known in 444, *and was unknown till that date.*

"This shows us in the first place that Deuteronomy contains an earlier stage of the law than the priestly Torah; and, further, as the date of Deuteronomy can be inferred from the date of its publication and introduction under Josiah, so, in like manner, the date of the composition of the priestly code, can be inferred from its publication and enforcement by Ezra and Nehemiah."

From the quotations already made we discover the sandy foundation on which Professor Wellhausen bases his argument, that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch.

In the eighteenth year of King Josiah he sent Shaphan to Hilkiah, the high priest, to give directions how the money which had been collected at the Temple should be applied towards the expense of repairing the breaches in the Temple, and on this occasion, 621 B. C., the high priest, who no doubt had already made some progress in repairing the Temple, said to Shaphan, the king's secretary, "I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord, and Hilkiah gave the book to Shaphan, and he read it;" and upon his reading it to the king he was greatly moved by the denunciations it contained against idolatry, and because Israel had not hearkened "unto the words of the book to do in accordance with all that is prescribed concerning us." 2 Kings, 23 chap., 21-22 verses.

"And the King commanded all the people, saying, Keep the Passover unto the Lord your God, as it is written in this book of the covenant.

"For there had not been holden such a passover from the days of the judges that judged Israel, and of the Kings of Judah."

From these latter verses an inference arises that before and during the time of the Judges the passover had been kept in accordance with the directions contained in the "Book of the Covenant" of the Lord, which Hilkiah, the high priest, had discovered in the process of repairing the breaches of the Temple; and that consequently the Book of the Covenant of the Lord (which our author calls Deuteronomy), must have been previously known.

It is, therefore, a surprise that Professor Wellhausen should have drawn from the same facts an opposite inference.

The discovery of this book is conclusive evidence that it must have had an existence before it was discovered; and if it existed before that time the natural inquiry would be, how long before that time did it exist, and were its contents known at an earlier period?

Instead of prosecuting this inquiry, the learned professor says, in his authoritative way, "*having been unknown previously.*" And yet there is no logical connexion arising from the fact of finding the book which would authorize the conclusion drawn from this fact that it had not been previously known. Having discovered this breach of continuity between a fact and the illogical conclusion drawn from it by Professor Wellhausen, I am reluctantly constrained to insist on *some evidence* of a fact, even when advanced by so distinguished a writer as Professor Wellhausen, before I can accept his mere unsupported assertions as any evidence whatever.

But on what ground does the professor undertake with apodeictic certainty to say that "the Book of the Covenant," which was found in the Temple, was the book of Deuteronomy, rather than Exodus or that of the Pentateuch?

No evidence whatever is adduced to sustain this assertion; it amounts, therefore, to a mere conjecture, because the injunction to observe the passover is as strongly insisted on in the Book of Exodus as it is in the Book of Deuteronomy.

In 2d Chron. 35th ch., and 6th verse, King Josiah, after the Book of the Covenant was found, gave directions in regard to celebrating the passover, as follows:

"So kill the Passover and sanctify yourselves, and prepare your brethren that they may do according to the word of the Lord, by the hand of Moses."

And again, in verse 12th, it is said, "as it is written in the Book of Moses." And in the 18th verse it is said, "and there was no Passover like to that kept in Israel from the days of Samuel the Prophet."

It is highly probable that Solomon, when he built the Temple, 1012 B. C., caused either the original or a copy of the Pentateuch to be securely enclosed in one of the stones of the Temple, or in cement, and built into some portion of the wall just as it is done in our day, when copies of the Bible are placed in the corner-stones of our churches.

And if it was the original, "by the hand of Moses," the finding of the Book, 391 years after it had been deposited there, will account for much of the emotion felt by Josiah; and as our Pentateuch is substantially a copy of this ancient book, "by the hand of Moses," we are brought much nearer to the awful realities of Sinai than is generally supposed.

The learned Professor, and those who train with him, insist on a Hexateuch, rather than a Pentateuch, and include the Book of Joshua in the Pentateuch; the reason for this appears obvious; the Book of Joshua is a witness for Moses, and the Pentateuch, and by including this book in the number of those assailed, Moses and the Pentateuch are intended to be deprived of the earliest witnesses to the authenticity of the Mosaic record.

After disposing of the Book of Deuteronomy in the manner above indicated, our author proceeds to divide the residue of the Pentateuch into two sections, which he names respectively the Priestly Code and the Jehovist.

According to Wellhausen, the first chapter of Genesis is to be classified with the Priestly Code, and the second chapter of Genesis with the Jehovist division, and then Professor Wellhausen proceeds to point out alleged contradictions between first Genesis and second Genesis.

It will here be in order to consider the value of these objections.

There is a striking and remarkable unity pervading the whole of the Pentateuch; so much so, that the attempt to sunder it, fairly taxes and masters the utmost ingenuity of the learned critic.

The sections or paragraphs in first and second Genesis in our English Bibles should have been so divided that the second chapter would begin with the fourth verse.

There is nothing in the second chapter following the fourth and fifth verses to which the word *elleh*, "these," can be referred, and as the word *elleh* in Hebrew, as often refers to what went before, as to what follows, we must permit it here to refer to a preceding clause or to an omitted paragraph in the second chapter substantially of the same import as the narrative of the creation in the first verse of the first chapter.

In giving a brief summary of the "*toledoth*" of the first chapter, something is added in this chapter of great scientific value, in reference to the primeval condition of the atmosphere. Until the whole atmospheric belt which surrounds the earth was saturated with the evaporations from the earth and sea, no rains, as we have them now, could fall; but until this saturation took place, the earth was watered with the mists, which arose in the day-time, and fell at night, as dew.

The narrative following the first chapter, runs thus: "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth in their being *created;* in the day that the Lord God created earth and the heavens, and every shrub of the forest, *terem*, before it was in the earth, and every plant of the field, *terem*, before it grew, for the Lord God had not rained on the earth, and there was no man to till the ground; but a mist went up from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground."

In the face of such explicit reference to the creative operations of the first day recorded in first Genesis, the learned Professor makes, on page 507, the following statement:

"The history of the first man in Paradise, has nothing to do with the preceding record of the creation of the world in six days which is neither referred to nor presupposed."

The three instances that I have already adduced, namely, the assertions of the author "that Deuteronomy became known in 621 B.C., *having been unknown previously;*" and that "the *Torah* in the rest of the Pentateuch became known in 444, and was *unknown till that date.*"

Together with his assertion just quoted, that "the history of the first man in Paradise has nothing to do with the preceding

record of the creation of the world in six days, which is neither referred to nor presupposed," constrain us, however reluctantly, to come to the conclusion, that the judgment of the learned writer falls immeasurably beneath the standard of both his scholarship and his position as a teacher in a distinguished university.

After referring to so much of the contents of the first chapter of Genesis, as was necessary to show that the second chapter was a continuation in greater detail of the creation of man, and of the provision which was made for his sustenance and happiness, the narrative of the second chapter proceeds:

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul; and the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom he had formed; and out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of Life, also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of Knowledge of good and evil; and a river (stream) went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted and became into four heads [and became tributary to a quaternion of great rivers.]"

In speaking of the foregoing narrative, on page 507, the learned Professor drops the words which constitute the beginning of the sentence, "these are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created," and starts in the middle of the sentence, "In the day that Jehovah made the earth there was, as yet, no plant of the field upon the earth, and no herb grew in the field, for Jehovah had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground; but a mist went up from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground.

"And Jehovah formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life."

The representation of this narrative by the learned Professor is altogether different from that manifest on the face of the record.

"These" (the account of the creative operations described in the first chapter) "are the generations of the heavens and the earth in their being created, in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven, and every shrub of the forest, *terem*, before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field, *terem*, before it grew, for the Lord God had not rained on the earth, and there was no man to till the ground."

The reference is to the early creative operations described in the first chapter, including the divine fiat which caused the earth to be clothed with vegetation before it had rained and before there was any man to till the ground.

All this is a rational and appropriate introduction to the detailed narrative of the creation of man, which is connected with the preceding part of the narrative by *wav*, connective, to preserve the continuity of the narrative, which connective in the authorized English translation is rendered, *but*.

Thus: "But there went up a mist from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground, *adamah*. And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

The text, in its entirety, recites that the preceding or some other narrative gave an account of the Genesis of the heavens and of the earth, and of vegetation anterior to its natural growth.

By omitting a part of the recital, the learned Professor makes this narrative to affirm that,—"In the day that Jehovah made the earth there was, as yet, no plant of the field upon the earth, and no herb grew in the field."

One is a recital of a preceding account of the creation; the other is an independent affirmation of a fact relative to the creation.

The difference between the statement in the text and the Professor's version of it is manifest.

One gives full force to the demonstrative pronoun *elleh*; the other omits and disregards it, so as to make good the assertion of the learned critic that "the history of the first man in Para-

dise has nothing to do with the preceding record of the creation of the world in six days, which is neither referred to nor presupposed."

To further illustrate the want of accuracy and logical precision in this article of Professor Wellhausen, I quote as follows from page 507: "There (chapter 1st) man is made last of all, but here first of all; before vegetation and according to 2 sq.; also before the beasts. . . . Gen. 1st has Elohim; Gen. 2nd and 3rd, Jehovah. Gen. 1st has the technical word *bara*, 'create,' while the other narrative uses the ordinary word *asa*, 'make,' *yatsar*, 'formed,' etc."

A careful examination of the Hebrew text of Gen. 1st and 2nd will refute all these latter objections.

The name Elohim, for God, occurs eleven times from the 4th to the 25th and last verse of Genesis 2nd, in connexion with the word *yah-we*, Jehovah. And in the 4th verse of the 2nd chapter the infinitive constructive of the verb *bara* is used: "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, *bibaram*, in their creation, in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven."

In reviewing the criticism of the learned Professor on the Pentateuch, we can afford to be quite irenical; many of his objections are so superficial that one feels like asking pardon for consuming time in refuting them. It is not the weight of the criticisms, but the distinguished position of Professor Wellhausen as a teacher at the University of Halle, which invites a review of his criticism of the Pentateuch.

But the learned Professor further says: "There (in ch. 1) man is made last of all; but here (in ch. 2) first of all, before vegetation, and . . . before the beasts." As to the second of these assertions, it will only be necessary to refer the reader to the narrative of the 2nd chapter, and he will find the representation there refutes the objection; the learned critic refers as specifically to the 19th verse, *et sequens*, of this 2nd chapter; but upon turning to the passage to which we are referred, we find nothing there to sustain the point made.

The first chapter furnished a definite chronology of the order of creation; the second supplements it with unchronological details which would have been out of place in an exact statement.

Perhaps no competent judge will be disposed to differ with the learned Professor in his estimate of the variance in diction and style of the two narratives when he says: "Gen. 1st is confined by a precise and formal scheme, while in Gen. 2 and 3 it has a free poetic movement." And it might have been added with strict propriety that the conception of both is absolutely original, and that neither the facts narrated nor the attendant circumstances of either are beneath the dignity of the self-existent Sovereign of the universe; and that even after the lapse of unnumbered ages these narratives have a perennial freshness which relegate them to a source higher and greater than human.

The learned author makes several verbal criticisms and among others the following, Gen. 12 and 6th verse, "The Canaanite was then in the land is *spoken to readers who had long forgotten that a different nation from Israel had once occupied the Holy Land.*"

This is a stupid criticism.

If Abraham or a contemporary writer, in describing his journey into Palestine where earlier Canaanite settlers were found, should add, that the Canaanite was then in the land, this would be quite natural, and an important historical incident which an historian ought not to omit; from such a statement, no inference could be drawn such as the learned Professor makes.

Moreover, the Hebrew particle rendered "then," is *az;* Gesenius in Lexicon, page 28, says of this particle "*az,*" A demonstr. part. originally of place, *in that* place, "there."

This particle is also used in the Old Testament as a designation of time.

The translator in considering the whole paragraph must decide whether the adverb *then* or *there* would be most agreeable to the context.

It so happens here, that either of them seem to harmonize with the context. If we adopt the latter, the whole paragraph will read thus: "And Abraham passed through the land unto the place of Sichem, unto the grove of Moreh; and the Canaanite was *there* in the land."

Under the circumstances indicated it was hypercritical for the learned Professor on such slender footing to attempt to impute to the Mosaic record a date subsequent to the Exile.

We learn from 10th Gen. 19th, that the descendants of Canaan, the youngest son of Ham, were settled on the coasts of the Mediterranean at Zidon and Gaza, at a very early period, and when Abraham left Haran, crossed the Jordan, and advanced into the interior of Palestine, as far as the grove of Moreh, and there first met the Canaanites, who were pushing eastward, it would be most natural for him or his historian to record the fact that the Canaanite was *az*, there in the land, or if it is preferred to say, that "the Canaanite was then in the land," that is, in the interior of the land, having advanced from the sea coast.

Again, we are referred to Gen. 36th ch., 31st v., "These are the kings that reigned in Edom before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," and of these words the learned critic says, "they have no prophetic aspect; they point to an author who wrote under the Hebrew monarchy." Very true; for not only these words, but also the whole of the genealogies of the descendants of Esau found in the 36th chapter of Genesis, are placed there from the 1st chapter of the 1st book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel.

At the close of the book of Deuteronomy, and after an account of the death of Moses, in the last chapter there is found this tribute to his pre-eminence above all the prophets: "And there arose not a prophet since, in Israel, like unto Moses whom the Lord knew face to face."

In reference to this statement the learned Professor says: "The writer is necessarily one who looked back to Moses through a long series of later prophets."

The book of Deuteronomy closed with the death of Moses, and the facts narrated from the 4th to the 12th and last verse of the 36th chapter were undoubtedly added by a later hand, for we have in the last eight verses an account of the age of Moses, his death and miraculous burial, the mourning that was made for him in the plains of Moab, and, in connection with the foregoing estimate of his prophetic character, the further fact, "that no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." But all this did not in the least touch the integrity and authenticity of the text.

These *addenda* on their face give notice that they were added at a later date, as much as if they had appeared on the margin. They take the place of a foot note, impose on no one, for they give notice that they were added at a later date than that of the events narrated in the body of the text.

On page 507 the learned Professor says, "The conception of the two narratives are different all through, as appears equally in what follows, 'Jehovah planted a garden eastward in Eden, at a point where the four chief rivers of the world are parted from a common source.

"'Here among other goodly trees, grew the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge.

"'In this garden Jehovah set the man, to crop it and to keep it, to eat of all the fruits, save only that of the Tree of Knowledge.'

"In chapter 1 man receives from the first as his portion, the whole great earth as he now occupies it; and his task is a purely natural one; be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it.

"But in chapter 2 the first man is placed in a mysterious garden of God, with a very limited sphere, where all is supernatural and marvelous.

"To speak generally, the ideas of God and man in chapter 1 are rational and enlightened, but bare and prosaic; in chapters 2 and 3 they are childlike and primitive, but full of meaning.

"The point of the contrast is mainly this: in Gen. 2, 3, man is in fact forbidden to lift the veil of things, and know the world, represented by the Tree of Knowledge; in Gen. I. this is his primary task, to rule over all the earth, for sovereignty and knowledge come to the same thing.

"There nature is to man almost a marvel; here it is a mere thing, an object for him, there it is robbery for man to seek to be as God; here God from the first created man in His own image, after His likeness, and appointed him His vicegerent on earth; with these incongruities in the substance and spirit of the two sections, we must take also the difference of form and language observable alike in the whole manner of the narrative, which in Genesis first is confined by a precise and formal scheme, while in Genesis second and third it has a free poetic movement and in individual expressions."

This statement contains a mixture of truth and of error.

A description of the architecture of the universe and the created things of the earth required a formal scheme.

The blessing is general, universal, and in harmony with the other great events narrated.

Be fruitful, multiply, fill the earth and subdue it.

Have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the fowl of the heavens, and every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

There is nothing in the second and third chapters which is in conflict with any of the commands of the Creator, in chapter 1, or in restraint of the enjoyment of the gifts bestowed.

The great world at large so freely and generously given, grew no tree of Life, and no tree of the Knowledge of good and evil. *Tob* and *Ra*.

These sublime symbols, planted in the Garden of Eden, by the hand of God, pointed the beholder to the mysteries of Life and Death in the spiritual world, which, still unsolved, agitate the hopes and fears of all the children of men.

In the state of Adam's innocence the fruit of the tree of Life was not prohibited.

The waters, the trees and flowers, and everything that grew were at his disposal, save only the tree of the Knowledge of good and evil. *Tob* and *Ra.*

The learned Professor, in order to make a contradiction between the first chapter and the second and third chapters, inadvertently or viciously changes the text of the second and third chapters, for he says:

"Here among other goodly trees, grew the tree of Life, and the tree of Knowledge," omitting the qualifying words of *good* and *evil.* And again, "to eat of all the fruits, save only that of the tree of Knowledge," again omitting the qualifying words of *good* and *evil.* And again in Genesis second and third, "man is in fact forbidden to lift the veil of things and know the world, represented by the tree of Knowledge," again, omitting of *good* and *evil.*

No tree of Knowledge is spoken of in the text other than that of the tree of *Knowledge* of *good* and *evil.*

The learned Professor is equally unfortunate in saying that the "world, (is) represented" by this fatal tree.

Taken in connection with the prohibition it represented sin and death.

The language of the prohibition was positive and unmistakable, "for on the day that thou eatest thereof, *moth tamuth*, dying thou shalt die."

The sentence of death fell on Adam for himself and as the representative of the whole race to spring from him by natural generation, and this marvellous transaction has been recorded and comes down to us through all the ages, because it concerns every individual of the human race.

We accept without hesitation the teachings of science, that the minutest particle of matter is acted upon and its movements, if it move, swayed and directed by the sum of all the matter in the universe, although the chain which binds them is as viewless as the wind; we know that from the lowest to the highest forms of vegetable life, these are dependent on the great central orb of day for life and for full development, and some

of them, in mute adoration, with upturned faces, salute the first glimpse of morning light, and follow the circuit of the sun until darkness hides him from view.

From a consideration of these physical facts, so obvious, we rise by an easy gradation to the conception that for the soul of man there is, external to himself, an inexhaustible beneficent fountain necessary to its complete development.

The contention about human freedom and divine sovereignty, is perhaps best reconciled by assuming that within certain limits fixed by the Creator, man is free; that beyond this human circle of freedom, God is absolutely sovereign.

Many things were granted to our first parents, while only one thing was forbidden.

The prohibited tree of *die Wissenschaft* of *good* and *evil*, notwithstanding its varied attractions was the first authoritative revelation of God's sovereignty; an objective illustration that in the constitution of things the individual will must conform to the Supreme will, or suffer the consequences involved in the divine sentence, *moth tamuth*, dying thou shalt die.

On pages 509 and 510, the learned Professor says, "The turning point in the history of worship in Israel, is the centralization of the cultus in Jerusalem by *Josiah* (2 Kings: 22, 23.) Till then there were in Judah, as there had been before in Samaria, a multitude of local sanctuaries, the *legitimacy of which no one dreamt of disputing.*

If Hezekiah made an attempt to abolish these local shrines, as we are told in 2 Kings 18: 4-22, it is yet plain that this attempt was not very serious as it had been quite forgotten less than a hundred years later.

Josiah's reforms were the first that went deep enough to leave a mark on history.

Not indeed, that the high places fell at one blow; they rose again after the King's death, and the attachment to them finally disappeared only when the Babylonian exile tore the nation from its ancestral soil, and forcibly interrupted its traditional customs.

The returning exiles were thoroughly imbued with the ideas of Josiah's reform, and had no thought of worshiping except in Jerusalem; it cost them no sacrifice of their feelings to leave the ruined high-places unbuilt.

From this date, all Jews understood as a matter of course, that the one God had only one sanctuary.

Thus we have three distinct historical periods: 1. The period before Josiah; 2. The transition period introduced by Josiah's reforms; and 3. The period after the exile.

Can we trace a correspondence between these three historical phases and the laws as to worship?

I. The principal law book embodied by the Jehovist, the so-called book of the covenant, takes it for granted in Exodus 24: 24-26 (should be 21 and 23) that altars are many, not one.

Here there is no idea of attaching value to the retention of a single place for the altar; earth and rough stones are to be found everywhere, and an altar of these materials fell into ruins as easily as it is built; again, a choice of materials is given presumably for the construction of different altars, and Jehovah proposes to come to His worshipers and bless them, not in *the* place where He causes his name to be celebrated, but at every such altar.

The Jehovistic law, therefore, agrees with the customary usage of the earlier period of Hebrew history; and, so, too, does the Jehovistic story according to which the patriarchs, wherever they reside, erect altars, and set up cippi (*maṣṣeboth*); plant trees and dig wells. . . . The altar which Abraham built at Shechem is the same on which sacrifices still continued to be offered; Jacob's anointed stone at Bethel was still anointed, tithes were still offered at it in fulfillment of vows, in the writer's own generation.

The things which a later generation deemed offensive and heathenish, high places, *maṣṣeboth*, sacred trees and wells, all appear now as consecrated by patriarchal precedent, and the narrative can only be understood as a picture of what daily

took place in the first century or thereabouts, after the division of the kingdom *thrown back into the past* and clothed with ancient authority.

II. The Deuteronomic legislation begins (Deut. 12) just like the book of the Covenant with a law for the place of worship.

But now there is a complete change; Jehovah is to be worshiped only in Jerusalem, *and no where else.*

The new law-book is never weary of repeating this command and developing its consequences in every direction. . . .

All this is directed against current usage, against what we are accustomed to do at this day; the law is polemic and aims at reformation.

This law, therefore, belongs to the second period of the history, *the time when the party of reform in Jerusalem* was attacking the high places.

When we read, then, that King Josiah was moved to destroy the local sanctuaries by the discovery of a law-book, this book, assuming it to be preserved in the Pentateuch, can be none other than the legislative part of Deuteronomy which must once have had a separate existence, in a shorter form, than the present book of Deuteronomy; this, too, is the inference to which we are led by the citations and references in Kings and Jeremiah."

III. "In the priestly code all worship depends on the tabernacle; and would fall to nothing apart from it.

"The tabernacle is simply a means of putting the law of unity of worship in an historical form; it is the only legitimate sanctuary; there is no other spot where God dwells and shows Himself; no other where man can approach God and seek His face with sacrifice and gifts. . . .

"Hence, we conclude that the priestly code builds on the realization of the object aimed at in Deuteronomy; and, therefore, belongs to the time after the exile, when this object had been fully secured."

This long extract from the article of the learned professor is

ingenious, and admirably calculated to mislead the weak and half-educated.

He assumes that Jerusalem is designated in 12th Deuteronomy as the one place of worship, when that nowhere appears.

There is not the slightest evidence of moral indignation against the fraud which the author assumes that he has exposed.

The argument by which this feat has been accomplished is drawn in large measure from the Pentateuch itself, and must, therefore, rest on a solid basis.

Such is the mirror which the learned professor holds up to our view; and, while exposing the fraud, the learned author also, without emotion or remark, brings into discredit the serried ranks of pious and learned men, Jews and Christians, who, for more than three thousand years have accepted the Pentateuch as a genuine and authentic document, and the man Moses as its author.

How has this remarkable result been reached?

If a writer is permitted to make the facts as he goes along, or if not that, if he is permitted to mold admitted facts to suit the exigency of his argument, or if it is allowed that he may, unchallenged, draw conclusions not warranted by the facts, then we can easily see how any desired results could be worked out.

The author says: "Till then (the reign of Josiah) there were in Judah, as there had been before in Samaria a multitude of local sanctuaries, the *legitimacy of which no one dreamt of disputing.*"

This sweeping remark is made for the purpose of discrediting the charge of Moses to the children of Israel, recorded in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy.

"These are the statutes and ordinances which ye shall observe to do in the land which the Lord the God of thy fathers giveth unto thee to possess it, all the days that ye live upon the earth.

"Ye shall utterly destroy all the places whereon the nations, which ye are about to drive out served their gods, upon the

high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree, and ye shall overthrow their altars, and break their statues, and their groves shall ye burn with fire; and the graven images of their gods shall ye hew down, and ye shall destroy their name out of the same place.

"Ye shall not do so unto the Lord your God, but unto the place which the Lord your God may choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye repair, and thither shalt thou come, . . . ye shall not do after all the manner that we do here this day; every one whatsoever is right in his own eyes.

"For ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which the Lord thy God giveth thee. . . .

"Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place which thou mayest see.

"But in the place which the Lord will choose in one of thy tribes, there shalt thou offer thy burnt offerings, and there shalt thou do all that I command thee."

Book of Joshua 5th chapter, 10th verse. The first passover was observed on the plains of Jericho at Gilgal.

Joshua, 18th chapter: The whole congregation of the children of Israel removed from Jericho, and set up the Tabernacle, which was first erected in the Wilderness, at Shiloh; and there the Ark of the Covenant was placed, and remained there a long time, until it was carried into the army and captured by the Philistines in the latter days of Eli, the prophet.

The Reubenites, the Gadites and the half tribe of Manasseh had obtained their possessions on the east side of the Jordan; but the men of war passed over the Jordan with the other tribes of Israel to assist in the conquest of the land of Canaan; and when this was accomplished, Joshua dismissed them to their own possessions (Joshua, 22d chapter) enjoining on them to observe all the commandments, and the law which Moses, the servant of the Lord, had commanded. And when, after leaving Shiloh, they came to the district of the Jordan, they erected there a great altar; and when the children of Israel

heard of this the whole congregation assembled at Shiloh to go up against them to war, and the children of Israel sent Phinehas, the son of Eleazer the priest, and with him ten of the princes of Israel to the children of Reuben and of Gad and of the half tribe of Manasseh, and addressed them as follows (verse 16):

"Thus saith the whole congregation of the Lord, what trespass is this that ye have committed against the God of Israel to turn away this day from following the Lord in that ye have builded you an altar that ye might rebel this day against the Lord?

"Is the iniquity of Peor too little for us from which we are not cleansed to this day? . . . .

"But that ye must turn away this day from following the Lord; and it will be seeing ye rebel to-day against the Lord that to-morrow he will be wroth with the whole congregation of Israel.

"Notwithstanding, if the land of your possession be unclean, then pass ye over into the land of the possession of the Lord wherein the Lord's Tabernacle dwelleth, and take possession among us, and rebel not against the Lord, and rebel not against us in building you an altar (*bilade*, apart from), beside the altar of the Lord our God."

Whereof the princes of the children of Israel were thus answered:

"The Lord God of gods, the Lord God of gods, he knoweth, and Israel he shall know, if *it be* in rebellion or if in transgression against the Lord, (save us not this day) that we have builded us an altar to turn from following the Lord, or if to offer thereon burnt offering or meat offering; or if to offer peace offerings thereon, let the Lord himself require *it*, and if we have not done it for fear of *this* thing (*dabar*, saying)—

"In time to come your children might speak unto our children, saying, what have ye to do with the Lord God of Israel? . . . therefore, we said let us now prepare to build us an altar, not for burnt offering nor for sacrifice; but that it may be a witness between us and you and our generations after us that

we might do the service of the Lord before Him with our burnt offerings, and with our sacrifices, and with our peace offerings; that your children may not say to our children, in time to come, ye have no part in the Lord.

"Therefore, said we, that it shall be when they should so say to us, or to our generations, in time to come, that we may say again, behold the PATTERN of the *altar* of the Lord which our fathers made, not for burnt offerings, nor for sacrifices, but it is a witness between us and you. God forbid that we should rebel against the Lord, and turn this day from following the Lord, to build an altar for burnt offerings, for meat offerings or for sacrifices (*bilade*, apart from), beside the altar of the Lord our God that is before his Tabernacle. . . .

"And the thing (*dabar*, answer) pleased the children of Israel, and the children of Israel blessed God, and did not (*amar*, speak to go up against them in battle), intend to go up against them in battle, to destroy the land wherein the children of Reuben and Gad dwelt."

From all this, we learn that the priests, the princes, and the congregation of the children of Israel, after they had conquered the land of Canaan, and had established the Tabernacle at Shiloh, as the only sanctuary for all the tribes, were very jealous that no sacrifices should be offered in any other place than at the one sanctuary, as Moses had commanded, on the other side of Jordan.

Thus early after the entry of the children of Israel into the land of Palestine, we have this decisive evidence that it was regarded as a national sin, for which God would hold all the tribes responsible, if a second sanctuary were set up; and, hence, the clamor for hostilities, against the tribes who were suspected of setting up a sanctuary east of the Jordan; and, yet, the learned Professor in the citations already made, says: "Till then (the reign of Josiah) there were in Judah, as there had been before in Samaria, a multitude of local sanctuaries, *the legitimacy of which no one dreamt of disputing.*"

Moreover, we learn from the 24th chapter of Joshua, that

when Joshua was old, he called together the princes, judges and elders of Israel and recounted briefly the history of Israel from the call of Abraham, their sojourn in Egypt, their bondage, passage of the Red Sea, and residence for a time in the Wilderness, and their wars, and entry into Palestine; and it is added "and Joshua made a covenant with the people on that day, and set them a statute and an ordinance in Shechem, and Joshua wrote these words, in the *book* of the *law* of God; and he took a great stone, and set it up there, under the oak by the *sanctuary* of the Lord, (for a witness of the covenant they had entered into to observe all the ordinances of Moses), and Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders who lived many days after Joshua, and who had known all the deeds of the Lord that he had done for Israel."

From this latter statement, the inference is quite irresistible, that during the lifetime of Joshua, and that for forty or fifty years after his death, until the whole generation was spent, which had crossed the Jordan, that the commandment by the hand of Moses, contained in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy was strictly observed; namely, worship in one place in one of the tribes which the Lord should choose.

And, yet, the learned Professor tells us, without a blush, as if unconscious of the falsehood, that until the time of Josiah no one thought of disputing the legitimacy of the local sanctuaries; and, by assuming this position he desires it to be inferred, that the commandment of Moses mentioned in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy was an invention of a later age; and, that such proof discredits the ordinances of Moses as they are found in the Pentateuch.

Thorugh the whole course of the argument, we find this able and ingenious advocate seeking to establish his hypothesis of fraud, not by a dispassionate critical sifting of the evidence, but partly by omitting to notice facts fatal to his hypothesis, and partly, by making deductions not involved in the premises or broader than the facts would warrant, and this is called the "higher criticism," which seems to paralyze multitudes of unstable minds.

The most important question involved in this contention is, the alleged conflict between the paragraph in the 20th chapter of Exodus, relative to the altar, contained in the 24th, 25th and 26th verses, and that part of the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy, contained in the 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th and 14th verses, relative to worship at one sanctuary only.

The question involved is one of importance and invites our most serious consideration.

The passage in Exodus is found in the chapter containing the ten commandments written on the tables of stone, and is as follows: "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen; in all the places where I record my name, I will come unto thee and I will bless thee."

The paragraph on the same subject which the learned Professor insists is in conflict with the foregoing directions in relation to an altar, is as follows, Deuteronomy 12th chapter, beginning with the 8th verse:

"Ye shall not do after all *the* things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever *is* right in his own eyes.

"For ye are not yet come to the rest and to the inheritance which the Lord your God giveth you.

"But *when* ye go over Jordan and dwell on the land which the Lord your God giveth you to inherit; and *when* he giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, so that ye dwell in safety, *then* there shall be a place which the Lord your God shall choose, to cause his name to dwell there; thither shall ye bring all that I command you; your burnt offerings and your sacrifices, your tithes, and the heave offerings of your hand, and all your choice vows, which ye vow unto the Lord, and ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God, ye and your sons and your daughters, and your men servants, and your maid servants, and the Levite that is within your gates; forasmuch as he hath no part nor inheritance with you.

"Take heed to thyself, that thou offer not thy burnt offerings

in every place that thou seest; but in the place which the Lord shall choose in one of the tribes, there shalt thou offer thy burnt offerings, and there thou shalt do all I command thee."

The first observation proper to be made here is, that the ordinance in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy was *wholly prospective.*

As a civil regulation, its observance would tend to unify and consolidate the tribes into a homogeneous body, and enable them better to act in concert, offensively and defensively.

As a religious observance it was a forward step, in which the whole nation collectively would acknowledge the reign of God; and, unconsciously, join in celebrating the mystery of the atoning sacrifice of the Lamb of God, slain from the foundation of the world.

That the ordinance of worship, mentioned in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy, was well known and in force as early as when Joshua had conquered the land of Canaan, is abundantly established by the indignation which prevailed throughout the whole congregation of Israel, on hearing a report that the tribes of Reuben and Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh were about to erect a different altar in the district of the Jordan, from the sanctuary and altar at Shiloh. See the facts as narrated in the 22d chapter of Joshua, from the 10th verse to the end, and in the presence of such facts, how utterly rash and inconsiderate the assertion of Professor Wellhausen, that the book of Deuteronomy was "*not known*" before the priest Hilkiah found it in the house of the Lord, in the reign of King Josiah, hundreds of years after the death of Joshua.

The learned Professor cites the paragraph above referred to in the 20th chapter of Exodus, in proof that the ordinances of worship mentioned in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy were unknown until the time of King Josiah.

I have already refuted this position, by evidence of the most convincing character cotemporaneous with the times of Joshua, and the generation succeeding him, and to sustain his position

based on this citation, the learned Professor, *inter alia*, says: "And Jehovah proposes to come to his worshipers and bless them, not in *the* place where he causes His name to dwell; but at every such place."

That part of the paragraph referred to in the 20th chapter of Exodus, material to be quoted, reads as follows in our English Bibles, beginning with the 22d verse:

"And the Lord said unto Moses, thus thou shalt say unto the children of Israel.

"Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven..

"Ye shall not make with me gods of silver, neither shall ye make unto you gods of gold.

"An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen; in all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee.

"And if thou make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone; for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it.

"Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon."

The learned Professor relegates this part of the Pentateuch to what he designates as the Jehovistic history book, while he places Deuteronomy in the "Priestly Code."

He said with much assurance, that the book discovered by Hilkiah when the Temple was being repaired, was the book of Deuteronomy, and quite inconsequently that it was unknown before that time.

So when he came to speak of the restoration of the law, Nehemiah 8th and 9th chapters, he says, page 514:

"It is closely analogous to the narrative of the introduction of the Deuteronomic law, under Josiah in 2d Kings xxii." . . .

So, we are told here, that the *Torah in the rest of the Pentateuch*, became known in 444 and was unknown till that date.

This shows us in the first place, that Deuteronomy contains an earlier stage of the law than the priestly *Torah;* and, fur-

ther, as the date of Deuteronomy can be inferred from the date of its publication and introduction under Josiah, so, in like manner, the date of the composition of the "Priestly Code" can be inferred from its publication and enforcement by Ezra and Nehemiah.

It is important to note here, that according to Wellhausen, the 20th chapter of Exodus from which I have quoted is a part of the "*Torah* in the rest of the Pentateuch" not known, as he says, till 444 B. C.

And yet, in the course of his argument against the authenticity of the ordinances in Deuteronomy relative to one sanctuary for all the tribes, he quoted this paragraph in the 20th chapter of Exodus as being an older stratum of the law, relative to worship directly in conflict with the law of worship in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy; but now, page 514, says: "That the *Torah* (law) in the rest of the Pentateuch became known in 444 *and was unknown till that date;*" although this "rest of the *Torah*" contained the ordinance cited from the 20th chapter of Exodus, and although he cited this very ordinance to convince us that the ordinance in the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy was not only in conflict with the patriarchal mode of worship, but also with this ancient ordinance found in the book of Exodus.

The "Higher Criticism" of which Prof. Wellhausen is the most persistent exponent, unwilling to admit the inspired character of the Pentateuch, and unable to account for its historical facts on rational grounds, originated the hypothesis that the books of Moses were inventions of a later date, dressed in the drapery of antiquity, and without any inspired or even historical value.

After careful consideration I find no conflict between the altar paragraph in the twentieth chapter of Exodus, and the ordinances relative to worship in the twelfth chapter of Deuteronomy.

The sacrificial altar of the Old Testament saints, after the exodus from Egypt, consisted of the foundation, and of the portable superstructure designed to rest upon the foundation, and both were called, *Mizbeach.*

At the time that the ordinances of worship were promulgated at Horeb, the Jews had many years of wandering before them in the desert of Sinai, before they could, according to the divine appointment, reach the promised land of Palestine; and, as they journeyed from place to place, many altar foundations would have to be raised by the people, to support the portable superstructure of the altar described in the 27th chapter of Exodus, from the 1st to the 8th verse, both inclusive.

It is evident that this portable superstructure was intended to cover and rest on the foundation of earth or stone. . . .

The superstructure was exclusively in charge of the priests, and was costly and durable; while the foundations of the altar were to be prepared by the people, and were to be plain earth or stone and inexpensive.

Hence Moses was directed to say to the children of Israel, "An alter of earth thou shalt make to me."

The last paragraph in the 20th chapter of Exodus and the first eight verses in the 27th chapter are in *pari materiæ* cotemporaneous in date, and according to the rule adopted in all the courts in civilized countries, must be construed together, and such construction fits in with the direction contained in the 7th and 8th verses of the 27th chapter of Exodus.

"And the staves shall be put into the rings, and the staves shall be upon the two sides of the altar, to bear it.

"Hollow with boards shalt thou make it as it was shewed thee in the mount, so shall they make it."

This portable altar, we may infer, was made hollow, so that it could be fitted over the foundations of earth or stone, which the labor of the people would prepare, at every point where the Tabernacle was set up.

And as we have no evidence that worship was offered at any other place than at the Tabernacle after it was completed and set up at each resting place in the journeyings of the Israelites through the Wilderness; a strong moral probability arises that from the time the Tabernacle was set up, there was but one sanctuary and one altar at which religious worship was offered,

although many altar-foundations were erected during the travel and sojourn in the Wilderness, and until the Tabernacle finally rested in Palestine at Shiloh; and from what has been already shown, sacrificial worship was confined to this one sanctuary and altar, until the last of the Hebrews had passed away, who crossed the Jordan with Joshua.

Nor can I accept the construction the learned Professor has put on the last clause of the 24th verse of the 20th chapter of Exodus.

After directing an altar, not altars, of earth to be erected for burnt-offerings and for peace-offerings, the text proceeds, "In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee."

Jehovah reserves the coming and the blessing to places where He may record His name.

Nor could the learned Professor make any thing for his construction, by appealing to the Hebrew text, for there "*maquom*," place, is in the singular and the Hebrew definite article is attached to it.

The most definite description of the pattern of the Tabernacle was furnished to Moses on the holy mountain, with all its measurements, lineal and cubic, and also of all the figures and emblems which were to adorn it, and all its vessels, curtains and appointments, and the relative size of the Holy Place, and of the Holy of Holies.

On comparing these measurements with the dimensions, lineal and cubic, of Solomon's Temple, which was begun to be erected 1012 years B. C. 1st Kings, 6th chapter; 2d Chron., 3d chapter, we find that the arrangements are identical and the dimensions of every part of which we have any definite description, are exactly double.

Thus the Holy of Holies in the Tabernacle was ten cubits each way; in the Temple twenty cubits each way. In the Tabernacle the Holy place was ten cubits high, ten cubits wide and twenty cubits long.

In the Temple all these dimensions were exactly double.

In the Tabernacle, the Porch was the width of the east end

of the Tabernacle, and in the Temple the width of the eastern end of the Temple, and was five cubits deep in the Tabernacle, and ten in the Temple.

The ground plan of the Temple was eighty cubits by forty; that of the Tabernacle was forty by twenty.

The walls of the Tabernacle were ten cubits high, and those of the Temple twenty cubits, and the whole height of the Tabernacle was fifteen cubits, and that of the Temple thirty cubits, the roof of the one rising five cubits above the height of the internal wall, and that of the other ten cubits.

The dimensions of the second Temple or Temple of Zerubbabel, about 520 years B. C., Book of Ezra, 6 and 3, was not in accordance with the dimensions of the Tabernacle or of the Temple of Solomon; but the sanctuary of the Temple of Solomon was precisely on the plan of the Sanctuary of the Tabernacle, only in this, that the dimensions of the Sanctuary of the first Temple were exactly double the dimensions of the Sanctuary of the Tabernacle, in many particulars; so that beyond all question both were copies of one plan; and the only plan of which we have any historical knowledge is the plan communicated to Moses at Sinai, and which he was commanded to observe in the construction of the Tabernacle.

Again, if the Babylonian Priests, as Professor Wellhausen argues, had invented the description of the Tabernacle and its furniture, and the dress and ornaments of the High Priest, described in the 20th chapter of Exodus and 12th chapter of Deuteronomy, then the invented Tabernacle would have been made to conform in all its dimensions and appointments with the second Temple or Temple of Zerubbabel constructed under the direction of these Babylonian Priests, or some even submultiple of such dimensions, and yet, we find that such a regulation was not observed.

It is not more than barely necessary here, to mention that the learned Professor and his confederates of the Higher Criticism, seek to establish the most stupendous fraud on the part of the Babylonian Priests, who were held in the highest estimation

by the greatest and most enlightened Kings of Persia—Cyrus, Darius and Artaxerxes.

The kingdom of Israel was rent asunder, 975 years B. C., and 476 years after the entry of the Jews into Palestine.

The ten seceding tribes established their capital at Samaria, Hebrew Shomeron, in the territory originally belonging to the tribe of Joseph.

The northern kingdom, after the separation, continued to flourish with varied fortunes for more than two hundred and fifty years, or to 721 B. C., when the capital was taken, and many of them carried into captivity by Salmanasar, the King of Assyria.

It would be quite incredible to believe that on the separation they did not take with them one or more copies of the Pentateuch as it then existed in 975 B. C.

Sixteen manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch have been discovered, written in the old *Ibri* or Samaritan characters, and these copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch do not differ materially from the Hebrew Pentateuch as it has reached us, except that Mount Gerizim is indicated, instead of Mount Ebal, as the place where certain lustrations were commanded to be observed by the children of Israel, after their entry into the land of Canaan; and some few other minor differences.

Some of these manuscripts were discovered long before the present phase of contention was mooted, and are evidence of a very high character of the great antiquity of the Pentateuch; and yet the learned Professor neither notices nor combats the effect of such evidence.

The entire absence of later Aramaic and Chaldaic from the Pentateuch, except in the single instance of the covenant between Laban, the Syrian, and Jacob his son-in-law, also remain unnoticed.

The reasoning by which the learned author reaches the conclusion that the Pentateuch is composed of three distinct parts, namely, Deuteronomy, the Priestly Code, and the Jehovist, is quite as inconsequential as his deductions concerning the date

of Deuteronomy and the rest of the *Torah*, and need not be discussed, except to say that a synthesis based on such a division would be impossible.

It must be admitted that Prof. Wellhausen is a man of ability and of undoubted learning.

His article on the Pentateuch, as well as his *Geschichte des Israels*, illuminate or dishonor the pages of the ninth edition of the British Encyclopædia, and he is regarded as the ablest exponent of the "Higher Criticism."

How then shall we explain the many rash and unwarranted conclusions drawn by him without adequate evidence to support them, and often against contrary presumptions and irresistible historical facts, that the "Priestly Code" did not originate in and after the exile?

Even Kuenen, a *colaborateur* with the learned Professor, observes "that it is absolutely necessary to start with the plain and unambiguous facts, and to allow them to guide our judgment on questionable points." . . "We must," he says, "first gain a general view of the whole field, instead of always working away at details, and then coming out with a rounded theory *which lacks nothing but a foundation*."

Dr. Thomas Brown, a metaphysician of some distinction of the last century, in discussing "cause and effect" attaches special importance to the influence of "oft-recurrent volitions" which resolve "into permanent and prevailing desires consequent upon deliberation."

In view of Professor Wellhausen's broad deductions from inadequate data must we not conclude that the learned Professor, having deliberated long over this subject, his permanent and prevailing desire to establish a favorite hypothesis, has so obscured his ability to weigh evidence—"That trifles light as air are (to him only) confirmations strong as proofs of Holy Writ."

Certainly, on no rational principle can the deductions of the learned Professor, based on the data before him, be made to coincide with a cool, dispassionate and calm judgment based on the same facts.

Neither Jew nor Christian can have any quarrel with the learned Professor and his coadjutors in the field of the "Higher Criticism;" they are but scavengers in the temple of science and philology, to make more manifest to this age of activity, enterprise, invention and research, the invulnerable character of the proof on which the Pentateuch rests.

Professor Wellhausen has added his own great ability and scholarship to the labors of his coadjutors for the last thirty years in the same field, and has embodied the results of their united assaults on the Pentateuch, in the article I am considering, and yet how feebly they strike, a mere pin scratch on the rock of Gibraltar.

There could have been no Moses and Aaron without a Pharaoh, and this iron age of merely intellectual judgments might have lost faith in the foundation of the Christian religion, if the great thinking force of Germany had not led and persisted in the assault which even in the judgment of one of the most judicious of the co-laborateurs in the same field, A. Kuenen, Professor at Leyden, has ended in a "rounded theory without a foundation."

The Aaronic cultus established by Moses in the Wilderness was continued after the entry of the Hebrews into Palestine, at the Tabernacle in Shiloh during the lifetime of Joshua, and after his death, as we have already seen, until all the generation was spent which crossed the Jordan.

This cultus consisted of a number of attendant particulars, the Tabernacle constructed according to the *tabnith* pattern shown to Moses in the Holy Mountain, the specific dimensions of the Tabernacle, the Ark of the Covenant, the Mercy Seat, the shew bread and the cherubim, the vestments and ornaments to be worn by the High Priest, the breast plate, the mitre with the inscription, "Holy unto the Lord," the ephod and the "Urim and Thummin," all as described in the 25th chap. to the 32d chap. of Exodus; and after this sanctuary was constructed it was, so far as the evidence shows, the only place of worship in the camp of the congregation of Israel, and the whole of the

religious cultus was observed at this one sanctuary, as commanded in the chapter of Exodus above referred to, even before the entry of the Israelites into Palestine, although the Lord, as we have already seen, only commanded by the hand of Moses, that the tribes after entering Palestine should worship at the sanctuary at one place, which the Lord should choose, and, in obedience to this command, Joshua established the Tabernacle at Shiloh, where the tribes all worshipped until the generation which passed over the Jordan with Joshua were spent.

The lapse after this period was at first gradual and went on increasing until the Ark of the Covenant was captured by the Philistines at the great battle of Aphek, in 1055 B. C., after which period the worship of Jehovah was divided between the shrines of Bethel, Gilgal, Mizpah, and Gibeon; but we have no evidence that any of the other ordinances of worship by the divine command which Moses had ordained in the Wilderness were not observed, so far as it was possible to do so, in the absence of a fixed Tabernacle or sanctuary of worship; even then, if the learned Professor had made out his point, (which he has not) that the religious cultus in Palestine, from the date of the entry of the Israelites into the promised land, was divided between several shrines and not confined to one place, this would be quite inconsequential.

The ceremonial worship under the Jewish dispensation in conformity to the ordinances mentioned in the 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th and 30th chapters of Deuteronomy, must have been of unsurpassed solemnity and grandeur.

It would be hardly possible, even in this age of invention, art and taste, to reproduce a religious ceremonial more solemn, sublime, impressive and artistic than the worship at the Tabernacle prescribed in the chapter of Deuteronomy referred to.

It consisted of many particulars, the altar of incense and of burnt offerings, the Tabernacle with its pecular dimensions, coverings and furniture; the Pontifical robes, vestments and ornaments of the High Priest, rivaling in minute splendor all the

colors of the bow of promise; and the injunction requiring this ceremonial worship to be observed at one sanctuary which the Lord should choose after the entry of the tribes into Palestine.

The learned Professor insists that the Jews, at all times, until after the Exile, worshiped at many shrines, and that it never occurred to any one that this worship at a plurality of shrines was in violation of the injunction recorded in the Book of Deuteronomy to worship at one sanctuary; and hence, the learned Professor draws the sweeping conclusion that all we read about the religious ceremonial in Deuteronomy was an invention of the Babylonian Priests after the exile, that is to say, in 444, B.C.

I have already shown that the assumption of Professor Wellhausen that the Jews at all times prior to the Exile worshiped at many shrines is a grave error, and is contradicted by the evidence; but if it were true, the failure of the Jews to observe one of the ordinances mentioned in Deuteronomy where that ordinance was a component part of a series of ordinances relative to worship, would not warrant the conclusion that the ordinances mentioned in Deuteronomy were the invention of a subsequent age; when it can be shown that many of the provisions of these ordinances were observed from the entry of the Jews into Palestine down to the time of the Exile and afterwards.

If it be a fact that the Latin church, for more than six hundred years has ceased to distribute to the laity wine in the celebration of the Holy Communion, such fact would not warrant the conclusion that our Lord did not institute the Last Supper, as narrated in the Gospel.

One of the most striking features of worship mentioned in Deuteronomy, was the *Urim* and *Thummim* in the breast-plate of the High Priest.

During the reign of Saul, the first king of Israel, when the disastrous battle of Gilboa was imminent (1st Samuel, 28th chapter, 6th verse), we read: "And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by *Urim*, nor by prophets."

The *Urim* was the oracle of judgment in the breast-plate of the High Priest, and never existed separate from it, and the breast-plate and its form and ornaments were component parts of the series of ordinances of worship ordained in the Wilderness at Horeb.

In 1st Samuel, 21st chapter, 9th verse, the Ephod in which the breast-plate was set, is incidentally mentioned as in the possession of Ahimelech, the High Priest at Nob, and also the shew bread.

This was after the loss of the Ark of the Covenant, which was captured by the Philistines at the battle of Aphek. In 2d Chron., 13th chapter, 11th verse, the shew bread and golden candlesticks are mentioned, 955 B. C.

Joshua, 18th chapter, 1st verse, the Tabernacle was set up at Shiloh and some time after the loss of the Ark of the Covenant, it was removed to Gibeon, where it remained until the Temple of Solomon was built on a larger scale, but of the same pattern.

These surviving relics prescribed in the ordinances of worship ordered at Horeb, which were still in existence hundreds of years after the Jews entered Palestine and several hundred years before the exile, conclusively establish the fact that the body of ordinances, of which they formed a part, were not the invention of a later age, as contended for by Prof. Wellhausen.

Fraud is never presumed, but must be proved by those who make the charge.

In view of what has been said in opposition to the contention of Wellhausen, it follows that the Professor has not made out even a suspicion of fraud.

If the inspiration of the Pentateuch and the miracles therein recorded were out of the question, the problem which confronts us would not be solved.

How were three millions, or even half that number, of lately liberated bondmen and their flocks and herds fed, watered and clothed for a period of forty years in an arid desert, deficient in water, game and pasturage?

How was it possible that the son-in-law of the Midian priest who had been absent from Egypt for forty years could prevail upon the ruler of Egypt to let his most useful laborers leave the country under the pretext of sacrificing the ram and the bull, animals, which the Egyptians held sacred and worshiped. Exodus, 8th chapter, 26th verse: "And Pharaoh called for Moses and for Aaron and said, Go ye sacrifice to your God in the land."

Moses answered: "Would not Egyptians stone us, if we sacrificed the abomination, *tolbah*, of the Egyptians before their eyes?"

Moses, if uninspired as an historian, ruler, judge and lawgiver, combined in his one personality a measure of human greatness far transcending that of any other man who has ever lived.

How is this to be accounted for? His laws, his statutes and his ordinances have formed the fundamental basis of the moral code and legislation which have governed and controlled the actions and lives of more human beings than now exist on the face of the globe.

The fall of Moses from the position of a divinely inspired lawgiver would shake the whole fabric of the Christian world, from centre to circumference.

The honored guest of the transfiguration on Mount Tabor, could not be dragged down from the exalted position ascribed to him for four thousand years, without involving the Gospel in his fall.

Superficial Christians regard the "Higher Criticism" with a feeling akin to fear; subjected to a rigorous scrutiny its spectral pretensions vanish like the mists of the morning.

NOTE—The word "the" in the sentence "not in *the* place, but in every such place," is italicized by Wellhausen; all other English sentences italicized by the reviewer.

APPENDIX.*

Prof. Greenleaf is the author of a treatise on the law of evidence which is quoted in all the courts of the United States as authority. The following rules of evidence are extracted from his treatise on the credibility of the Gospel, and are equally applicable in this investigation.

"Every document, apparently ancient, coming from the proper repository or custody, and bearing on its face no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes to be genuine, and devolves on the opposing party the burden of proving it to be otherwise.—*Greenleaf.*

"That the Books of the Old Testament, as we now have them, are genuine; that they existed in the time of our Saviour, and were commonly received and referred to among the Jews, as the same books of their religion, etc., are facts which we are entitled to assume as law, until the contrary is shown.—*Ibid.*

"These copies of the Holy Scriptures having been in familiar use in the churches from the time when the text was committed to writing . . . and having in all ages down to this day been respected as the authoritative source of all ecclesiastical power and government, and . . . acted under in regard to so many claims of right, on the one hand, and so many obligations of duty on the other. . . . It is for the objector to show them spurious; for on him, by the plainest rules of law, lies the burden of proof."—*Ibid.*

V.

CHRIST'S HEADSHIP AND SONSHIP.

BY THE LATE REV. S. H. GIESY, D.D.

UNIVERSAL allegiance and homage follow, by natural order of statement, and by necessary and inevitable consequence, Christ's essential and eternal Sonship. Fealty and sovereignty, belong to each other by inward necessity and not by mere outward arrangement and rule. To obey is the duty of the subject, to command the right of the sovereign. "Honor the King," whatever the outward form of government, is a precept grounded in the original divine constitution of society, and not in prudential consideration simply of the maintenance of good order and the peace, prosperity and happiness of mankind.

Being the "Only Son of God," of one self-existent nature with the Father, the authority of the Highest is His, the readiest subjection ours. Two words in the Creed stand for due and loving service on our part, for rightful sovereignty on His. The words, OUR LORD, express these two tremendous and potent facts: Christ's universal Headship and Rulership.

"Our" expresses the stubborn fact of a community of nature and need—a common ruin in Adam, a common redemption in Christ. In this broad, comprehensive sense it is used in the Lord's Prayer, on every one's tongue the world over. There it sounds the note of the universal Fatherhood of God, while here it is the glad note of the universal Saviourhood of Christ. Maurice is right in finding in its very first word the greatest difficulty in the ordinary and common use of this prayer. "How can we," he says, "look around upon the people whom we habitually feel to be separated from us by almost impassable

barriers; who are above us so that we cannot reach them, or so far beneath us, that the slightest recognition of them is an act of gracious condescension; upon the people of an opposite faction to our own, whom we denounce as utterly evil; upon men whom we have reason to despise; upon the actual wrong-doers of society, those who have made themselves vile, and are helping to make it vile—and then teach ourselves to think that in the very highest exercise of our lives these are associated with us; that when we pray we are praying for them and with them; that we cannot speak for ourselves without speaking for them; that if we do not carry their sins to the throne of God's grace, we do not carry our own; that all the good we hope to obtain there, belongs to them just as much as to us, and that our claim to it is sure of being rejected, if it is not one which is valid for them also? Yet all this is included in the word 'Our:' till we have learnt so much, we are but spelling at it."

There is everywhere the "baser sort" of men—sunk in sin and shameless with it all—but there is with them no monopoly of sin. "Sinners above all men" they may be, but not sinners alone. We be children of a common father, the offspring of a common root. And as in the Lord's Prayer "Our Father's" ear is alike open to every cry—so in the Creed just as little room can there be for any thought of meter and bounds to Divine mercy, any class-distinctions, any so-called "limited atonement." Far nearer the truth is this answer in the Church Catechism, when to the question, "What dost thou chiefly learn in these articles of thy Belief?" it says with directness on this point, "I learn to believe in God the Son, who hath redeemed me, and all *mankind*." And hence, here it is, not my Lord, nor your Lord, not this nor that man's Lord alone, but OUR LORD—broad and boundless comprehension! no class-proprietorship of any sort, whether by reason of Divine selection, or human birth and rank on the one side, or low and abject state on the other, but "all sorts and conditions of men," the humblest slave and the princeliest master equally needing and equally sharing in the redemptive virtue and power of this

one Lord of the race. "And there," a writer thus strongly puts it, "the queen upon her throne, or the nobles in her court, can have no larger share in, no nearer interest in, or access to Christ our Lord than the meanest beggar in our streets, or pauper in our workhouses. No one has a greater share in Him than another, because that humanity of which He is the Head is not a thing that admits of degrees, it is the common attribute of all, and none can monopolize a larger share of it than another."

Mankind is one family. The broad diversities so well known seem to be in utter contradiction of this idea of the unity of the race. Not a few eminent naturalists affirm that the cranial and facial, the physiological as well as the physiognomical differences, shape of head, size of brain, color of skin, texture of hair, are so marked and great as to be hopelessly irreconcilable with the theory of derivation from a single primal pair. Others of equal distinction assert that these varied types are traceable to the action, through the lapse of ages, of climatic and social influences. The question is too broad for discussion here. On our part we accept heartily the Scriptural narrative of the origin of man, running back to his Eden home, his original innocence, and its loss in Adam's failure.

But the moral diversity is no less marked and unmistakable than the physical; and yet no man thinks of denying the moral and spiritual unity of the race. The idea of God, the prevalence of action looking to the approbation of some higher Being, the presence and operation of conscience, some belief, shadow or otherwise, in an after state conditioned on life and conduct here, the universal sense of sin and misery thereby—these moral concepts belong to all races, descending from generation to generation like great heirlooms. The same moral taint flows through all veins. There are in the human heart abysses of evil which we have no line and plummet to sound. Whatever the complexion of the skin, or the set of the eyes, or the twist of the hair, it is all the same—there lie imbedded there the possibilities of a Judas or a John, of an infamous Nero or a holy

Paul, of an unscrupulous Quilp or a saintly Bunyan—One heart beats in every breast: said a prophet, "deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." This deep all-pervading consciousness of sinful capabilities, more astounding in some cases than in others, but alarming in all, makes all akin—every man a brother to every other man, all alike sinners, and all alike needing the one Saviour of mankind.

In Christ mankind stand under a second Head, and in a second probation. With graphic pen, with wonderful compass and force, St. Paul expresses in a single word His inclusive relation to our fallen race. He styles Him, "the second Adam," and so makes His redemptive work and merit to run parallel with the ruin effected by the first and fallen Adam. The misfortunes of the first have traveled down the ages, kept pace with the spread of the race, cut deep channels in the world's history for human blood to course through; and as well must the untold benefits of the Second recur to the ultimate generation of man. It is then, with the profoundest meaning, as with the widest effect of His saving power, that the apostle uses this appellation. In the first Adam, the race came to a common overthrow, and that under the least unfavorable circumstances of probation; in the Second, under circumstances the most adverse, it was brought to a successful probation and universal deliverance. Round these two representative men the whole history of mankind turns, first on the side of sin and death in the natural head, then on the side of salvation and life in the second and supernatural. The thought will recur again.

Headship and rulership are clearly one in this case for its own saving ends. Christ is our LORD. This was primarily a title of respect and honor,—the way inferiors spoke to or of superiors. The word carries along the idea of power or authority over others, but always as moderated and restrained by moral limitations. Among the Greeks a man in respect to his slaves was *δέσποτης*, but in respect to his wife and children *κυριος*, the natural relation softening and toning down the

sense of authority, "even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him *lord*" (1 Peter 3: 6).

As a title of proper deference and respect, the word passed into the original Greek of the New Testament, as servants to masters (St. Matt. 13: 27); as sons to father (16: 30); and as due from all to men in authority (27: 63); also from strangers to strangers, as when the Greeks spake to Philip, saying: "Sir (*κύριε*), we would see Jesus (St. John 12: 21); and as when Mary, taking the risen Christ to be the gardener only," said: "Sir (*κύριε*), if thou have borne Him hence" (20: 15). Thus as a dignified and decorous way of addressing another, it is the equivalent simply of our English, Sir. And on several occasions where the title is applied to Christ Himself, it is not to be denied that it is used in no higher and other sense than this, as when the Samaritanness at the well of Sychar addressed Him as a common Jew: "Sir (*κύριε*), thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep" (St. John 4: 11, 15, 19); as when the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda, not knowing who accosted him, said: "Sir (*κύριε*), I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool" (5: 7).

But such current use of the word, proper enough under all circumstances of outward deference and respect, is of secondary and derivative, not primary signification and force. Even such secondary use is not purely accidental, but, as just intimated, rests itself on facts which run back to the very beginning of human relations and language. Human authority is itself, as human relations, but the shadow of the higher, the Divine. The idea of dominion, power is inherent in the word itself.

Traced back to its ultimate root, whether under Hebrew, Greek, Latin or English form, it is found to be derived from a word signifying *to judge, to command, to direct, to rule*, and then as indicating in an imperious and arrogant manner its abuse sometimes, *to domineer*. Hence Adon, *κύριος*, dominus, lord, and Adonai, the LORD. In early Scripture, as conceding his right in this respect, Sarah called her husband "lord"

(Adon, Gen. 18: 12, *κύριος*, Septuagint, also 1 Peter 3: 6); so Eliezer, Abraham's chief servant, his master, time and again (24: 27, 35, 37); so Rachel, her father Laban (31: 35); so Potiphar is named the "lord" of Joseph, whom he had bought (39: 2); and so Joseph in power at the Egyptian court, to whom they made dutiful obeisance, was thus named by his brethren (42: 10). These earliest instances show that the word expressed the position of power on its human side; as husband, master, ruler, and governor, prince.

In our English Bible this word properly enough stands for the Hebrew JEHOVAH. Profound reverence for this sacred name of God forbade the Jews pronouncing it, and *Adonai*, the *Lord*, became the common substitute. In the Septuagint version *κύριος* is the usual equivalent for Jehovah, as *Dominus* is in the Vulgate. Adonai was employed rather in a generic sense, as *θέος* among the Greeks, and Deus among the Latins; while Jehovah was regarded as the strictly personal and proper name of God, and hence breathed rather than spoken. The translators of the Septuagint were not careful to observe this distinction, indiscriminately using *κύριος*, LORD, as expressive of Deity, and as answering as well to the proper name of God as His title by absolute and exclusive right as the One, All-powerful Ruler. This sense of direct personal and indisputable authority is beautifully preserved by the Psalter in its translation of the 8th Psalm: "O LORD, our Governor, how excellent is Thy Name in all the world!" Thus, under its old Hebrew form, and as clearly under the corresponding Greek, Latin and English, the title LORD stands for Self-existent and Self-sufficient Being, the absolute Source of all things, "the living God" (Psalm 42: 2).

And where the title is applied by the New Testament writers to Christ in direct reference to His unique character, it makes His co-equality with the Father, His Eternal Sonship, and by virtue of that His singular and exclusive property, His rightful claim on man's allegiance, homage, worship, obedient and affectionate service. As expressive of this real Jehovistic force

and meaning of the name, and His own essential right to the same, they habitually speak of Him, not as a Lord—one among ten thousand others—but definitely and emphatically, as "*the* LORD." Says St. Paul, "*the* LORD of glory" (*τὸν κύριον τῆς δοξης*, 1 Cor. 11: 8); "the Lord from heaven" (*ὁ κύριος ἐξ ουρανοῦ*, 15: 47); and St. John, with marvellous emphasis, "KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS" (Revelation 19: 16). "Come see the place where *the* LORD lay" (*ὁ κύριος*, St. Matt. 28: 6). "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon" (St. Luke 24: 34). "They have taken away *the* LORD out of the sepulchre" (*τον κύριον*, St. John 20: 2). "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto thee" (*ἀπό τῶν κύριον*, 1 Cor. 11: 23). In no mind did the fact of Christ's resurrection encounter such stubborn unbelief as in the case of St. Thomas. The testimony of ten men, as honest and competent as himself, who positively affirmed to him, is not believed by him, and he stoutly claims for himself the ocular proof which had been vouchsafed them, for the want of which a whole week is spent in dejection and gloom. And when what he so persistently demands at length comes, even with a merited rebuke, sweeping away the night of his soul, there springs to his lips this irresistible conviction: "My LORD and my God" (St. John 20: 28). Thus, the Gospel closes as, in fact, it opened. Undoubtedly, in this absolute and specific sense, the angelic announcement to a yearning world, erst sounded in the ears of Bethlehem's dazed and hardly half-conscious shepherds, is to be taken: "For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour which is CHRIST THE LORD" (St. Luke 2: 11).

It is, then, in His mysterious nature—heaven's eternal Prince though in earthly guise, the "Son of the Highest" (St. Luke 1: 32), yet the Son of the lowliest, the Virgin-born, and yet, incomprehensible fact! "God of God"—it is in this oneness of essence and existence with God, where we do and must find the deepest ground for the exclusive appropriation of this title. And, thus, because in His unique person the redemptive Head

of universal humanity, He is its true and proper Lord, in whose name and by whose merits alone our prayers go up to the one God and Father of us all. "Through Jesus Christ our Lord;" "through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," thus it is that Collect after Collect is brought to an end.

How otherwise than upon the basis of absolute Sonship by essential Divinity is this well-nigh invariable language to be defended, and itself redeemed from the charge of mere pious sentiment or unmitigated blasphemy! In the mutilated Prayer Book of King's Chapel, Boston, originally Episcopal, but perverted to Unitarian use and service, the usual formula still stands while the Divine personality lying back of it is repudiated. It is worse than useless, aye, unblushing mockery, bold effrontery to go to God in this way, and as with a lie in our mouth, if there be no adequate and absolute Reality back of the Name itself and the current phrase. If He be not all and what He claimed, all and what the New Testament writers are ever claiming for Him, we have no business to be thus always dragging in His name to give efficacy to prayer and access to the Almighty Throne.

But it is by no means a mere empty title. Earth groans under the bondage of a usurping lord. Wearing his coronet of sin, Satan early appears in history a marplot, the restless and unresting spirit of mischief, suggesting evil, arresting good, confusing the sober sense of right and wrong, making the worse appear the better course, darkening the reason, perverting the will, defiling the soul, and turning the life of man from its true polarity and path, to close in Pandemonium the sorry work of undoing begun in Paradise. Goethe gives in his *Faust* an admirable and accurate conception of this destructive character when he puts in the mouth of his Mephistopheles this bold self-proclamation: "I am the spirit who evermore denies." Negation, confusion, destruction, mischief in the higher realm of being has been his remorseless and unremitting work from the very advent of man.

It is a common and smart thing to proclaim disbelief in the

personal existence of Satan. This comes, partly, from the disinclination to credit any spiritual order of beings, good or bad, God or Devil, and, partly, from the absurd and plentiful caricatures which across the centuries have been thus associated in human thought by profound art. If for political ends it is a man's purpose to bring odium and contempt upon the most prominent characters in a nation's view, he finds no more effective means than the horrid cartoon. Debased art has been widely damaging in this regard, turning the whole serious affair into derision and contempt. But through all this sorry travesty the thought cannot be put aside, that the burlesque to be itself an effective thing must rest in a dire reality. Falsehood is truth perverted or exaggerated. Proximity to truth alone gives it deceptiveness and currency. The lie which has not a grain of truth at the bottom carries a corrective on its face. Where there has been no infamy or fault of character the political cartoon is without point or power. And so that headship of evil which comes to the front in the opening chapter of human life and history finds confirmation rather in the caricatures which silly fancy has perpetrated, and is ever parading before the eye.

Another says with force, "unless much of God's word is meaningless enigma, there is a subtle spirit of vast power who fell through pride and transgression from a higher estate, whom God has not annihilated, and whom for infinitely wise purposes, He permits to live, and by way of discipline to try the spirits of men. Uniformly it represents the antagonism of evil to good under such concrete form—a malignant personality called in Hebrew, Satan, Abaddon, in Greek Apollyon, ὁ διάβολος, from which comes the English term devil. Satan is *the evil one*, not merely the principle of evil, "but the evil principle itself *in persona*—ὁ πονηρος. Gesenius, the Hebrew lexicographer, is a sufficient authority for the statement, that "with the article הַשָּׂטָן *the adversary κατ' ἐξοχήν*, it assumes the nature of a proper name, i. e. *Satan*, ὁ διάβολος, *the Devil*, the evil spirit who seduces men to evil." The occasion of man's fall was no

original proclivity in him to evil, no perverse disposition overpowering good. The first incitement to sin, it is clear enough, came *from without*—the work, if the Biblical account goes for anything, of a Titanic power outside of and distinct from man. "The *serpent* beguiled me, and I did eat," is the first bitter confession from sinning lips. The evil passes down with our complete nature. Every soul comes into the world under the taint of sin.

Every kingdom has its headship. In holy Scripture, the kingdom of darkness is conceived of as a vast infernal hierarchy, with its arch-ruler variously called, "*the prince of devils*," (ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονιων, St. Matthew 12: 24), "*the prince of this world*, (ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κοσμου τούτου, St. John 12: 31, 14: 30, 16: 11), "*the god of this world*," (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τουτου, 2 Corinthians 4: 4), indicating the personality of this evil spirit beside the sphere mainly of his evil operations; "the ruler of darkness," and "the power of death," indicating the universal domination of sin and death to be his infernal and inveterate purpose; "principalities and powers," indicating the diversity and multiplicity of the diabolic agencies under his authority and direction.

The reversal of this hostile order follows. Eternal purity and love will not brook the usurpation. The works of the devil must be destroyed (1 John 3: 8.) This was the Divine purpose, as it appears, from the beginning. How effected? Not by omnipotently annihilating the prince of darkness, but sending to the earth from the very courts of heaven the Prince of Life, and establishing a counter Kingdom of light and truth, righteousness and holy obedience.

As by the rebellion of his will the integrity of man's nature was ruined, so only in the submission of his will to God's in a truly representative and real life is its restoration at all possible.

Hence the advent of the Son of God in the flesh and the work of the second Adam; conflict with hellish powers and victory at every point; man's common life of temptation and the

uncommon life of entire sinlessness and perfect obedience; and death at last on the cross with signal triumph over the grave and visible return to the heaven whence He came. "Thou art the King of glory O Christ." No title more dearly earned. No title more completely and absolutely His: "Our LORD." "To this end Christ both died and rose again, that He might be LORD both of the dead and of the living" (Romans 14: 9).

Two great powers cross swords over the very cradle of humanity; and again over the rude manger of Bethlehem, humanity's new birth. The seeming utter defeat of good in the collapse of our moral nature is followed, in due course, in the effectual triumph of good, in a successful probation under a new Headship, Leader, and Lord, not weak and frail as the first, but firm and changeless under strongest temptation and severest trial, proving Himself; "Stronger than the strong man armed."

It was at infinite cost, by bloody conquest, this great deliverance was effected. "We are not our own, we are bought with a *price*" (1 Corinthians 6: 19, 20); "with body and soul, both in life and death, we belong unto our faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, who, with His precious blood, has fully satisfied for all our sins, and delivered us from all the power of the devil."

This glorious achievement in Christ is of truly perennial character and force, embracing all nations, sweeping all ages. It is never to fail of this wide and gracious end. Hence, the redemption which originally stood in His person is not allotted to run out into a spiritual abstraction, a vague and vapory idea, mere pious thought and sentiment, but under His own hand, takes on definite and concrete reality. The Church is established and constituted the sole organ and medium of grace and salvation onward to the millennial Kingdom and glory—not a happy accident, a pious device simply, as some would have it, but itself of the very essence of Christianity. As a spiritual organization for spiritual and eternal ends, the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, with its historic ministry, its ecumenical Creeds, its catholic order, its sacramental channels, all its saving powers, confronts us to-day still as much as it ever did when apostolic

men went up and down the world "discipling" the nations. "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church" makes a constituent element of Christianity and therefore of the Creed.

Redeemed generically, men are to be *saved* individually. Right at the door of the Church a man meets the Baptismal font, the signal though silent reminder of the necessity of that initial Sacrament. Natural birth is a birth in sin. Every soul comes into the world under its taint. Early, by its representatives and sponsors, the Church takes the child born in sin, and by a solemn sacramental transaction and covenant, transfers it from the Kingdom of nature and sin to the Kingdom of grace. It is a most significant and real act. Nor, as the child is signed with the sign of the cross, does the Church hesitate to pronounce it the child's new birth, and call for thanks for its actual adoption into the family of God.

The act marks not the happy end but the awful and sublime beginning of the individual struggle against the worst side of our nature,—in-born propensities to, and all the outward forces of evil: commits us, as Christ's faithful soldiers and servants, to a manful fight under His banner against sin, the world, and the devil.

"One is our Master." "No man," He does Himself tell us, "can serve two lords; for either he will hate the one and love the other: or else he will hold to the one and despise the other."

Thus follows: in the profoundest sense of the word, to make Christ OUR LORD to enthrone in the very centre and core of our being the powers of good for which He stands in the world; to surrender our will to God's will, even as did He, according to this sublime word: "I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of Him that sent me" (St. John 6: 38); to make His life the law and pattern of our own, and in some sort, a like noble and ennobling thing.

Confessing His absolute property in us, be it our aim that "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord," (Romans 14: 8.). Asked what he should

do if Christ came into the room, Charles Lamb made reply: "I should of course fall down on my knees." Good! But loyalty to that Name means a great deal more than any mere outward acts of reverence, and devotion, means a life at every point brought into free and sweet accord with the pure and holy life of the MASTER, evermore showing forth His praise.

"Hail Him, the Heir of David's line,
Whom David, Lord did call;
The God incarnate! Man divine!
And crown Him Lord of all!"

VI.

THE MYSTERY OF EVIL IN THE NATURAL WORLD.

BY REV. SAMUEL Z. BEAM, D.D.

It is not proposed, in the following inquiry, to solve an inexplicable riddle. That is a task which may be left for the ingenuity of the curious. Metaphysicians and scientists may rack their brains in the hitherto futile attempt to discover the metaphysical origin of evil, if they choose. To the writer it appears a useless and vain endeavor to disclose a secret which has so far eluded the search of human ken.

Viewing the question from the Christian standpoint, however, it may be said that moral and physical evil must be traced to sin as its source. Sin has its origin in the self-determining power of personal freedom; and evil is its legitimate fruit.

Sin is conditioned by freedom. Freedom is predicable only of a personal being. Hence evil, the natural consequent of sin, has its producing cause in the will of personal beings. If we inquire for the motives, there are none that seem to have any rational foundation. The will determines not to adhere to the right. The free moral agent, refusing the good, chooses to do evil. Why, is a mystery. It is an unreasonable choice, and therefore reason can furnish no adequate explanation for its existence.

In Holy Scripture we find that sin appears to have been in existence before the creation of man. The temptation in the garden of Eden, which our first parents failed to resist, and in consequence of which they fell from the state of innocence, was presented to them from without, by a personal being, symbolized by the serpent. In the book of Revelation he is called "that

old serpent, the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world."* From what the Scriptures say of him, he appears to be an individual, not merely the personification of "Cosmical" evil, but an actual person, who reasons and acts according to his own self-determination. But in addition to this, the divine record informs us of an organized kingdom of evil spirits, of which Satan is the head. Each one of these demons is a personal being, acting according to his own will, and always for the purpose of working mischief. By their sinister agency, the evils to which men are exposed are continually obstructing their pathway through life. We furthermore gather the information that the devil and all his organized host of wicked spirits were created angels, pure and holy, whose natural instincts and propensities would have led them to choose the good; but they "kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation" (Jude 6†). Now, they are fallen angels, angels of the devil. Satan is "a deceiver," "a liar," "a murderer;" ‡ and his angels may be truly characterized by the same epithets. Satan appears to have led all the rest into sin and rebellion against God, and their whole employment consists in persistent and malignant efforts to frustrate the will of God, and to inflict misery on men. Accordingly, with such evil intent, the serpent invaded the garden of Eden, and beguiled our first parents to their own personal injury, and that of all their posterity. As they gave way to the temptation, they fell into sin against God and brought death into the world, with all the untold wretchedness and sorrow which that dreadful calamity involved.

A proper apprehension of these facts makes it very evident that sin existed, not eternally, but yet before the creation of man, and that man, very soon after his advent, was confronted with temptation and became the victim of diabolical cunning and malice, although he might, and should, have resisted the temptation, because he was entirely free to choose the right, and enjoyed all the advantages of a natural predisposition in favor of

* Rev. 12: 9; Ch. 20: 2. † See John 8: 44.
‡ Rev. 12: 9, and 20: 3; John 8: 44.

the right. In consequence of the fall death reigns in the world, according to the warning declaration of God, when He prohibited their eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." * The transgression caused the seeds of mortality to be planted in human nature, there to grow and flourish and ripen into the harvest of death. Thus death has reigned, from the time of Adam, among men. But yet we actually find death reigning in the earth, in the world of animated nature, long before the advent of man. The sin of man, therefore, cannot be the cause of *all* death, for it is unreasonable to suppose that consequences of human sin could anticipate the commission of the sin, involving the destruction of life in the organic world, together with the cataclysms, catastrophes and revolutions in the inorganic world, which the strata of the earth reveal as having taken place prior to the creation of man. But here, in the midst of an universal reign of law, we discover the foot-prints of *Ανομία*, everywhere violating and disturbing what otherwise would be a perfect, normal and harmonious unfolding of the divine system of the *κόσμος*.

The laws of nature, in their natural order, cannot come into violent conflict, without denying thereby the perfect unity of creation, or disturbing the harmony of the divine purpose in calling them into existence. These laws are, in their nature and design, harmonious, as is evident everywhere in the general tendency of nature to keep things in order, or to rectify what has become abnormal, or to restore what has been injured, or to beautify what has become unsightly. They are, indeed, sometimes opposite in their purpose, but not contradictory; and in their mutual working they may be said to modify and complement each other, thereby the more fully developing their higher concord. But no law of nature was ever designed to antagonize another or to nullify any of its results. And yet nature has been racked and torn and tortured till its wounds are visible often to the untrained eye; and thus the elements

* Gen. 2: 17.

of discord and lawlessness betray their presence everywhere throughout that part of nature's domain which has been traversed by the human mind.

As nature's laws are violated, and as we cannot conceive of the Creator in any sense as the author of confusion, we must look in some other direction for the source of these evils. To the writer it seems perfectly natural to attribute this chaotic state of the world, with all its evils, to demoniac influences.

From the character imputed to evil spirits, in holy Scripture, they appear to have arrayed themselves in an attitude of irreconcilable antagonism towards God, having malignantly determined to frustrate if possible, or at least to obstruct, His wise and benevolent purposes. If they knew that the creation of the physical universe was a preparatory act, preliminary to the creation of living creatures, vegetable and animal, and that these were intended for the use and happiness of intellgent beings like men, we may well suppose that they would seize the opportunity afforded thereby to try their ingenuity in the malicious attempt to frustrate God's loving purpose. And if this be true the history revealed by geological research becomes an exhibition of the records of the sad results of demoniacal interference with the true development of nature.

The theory of evolution attempts to account for the processes through which nature has come to its present condition, on purely physical principles, allowing no room for intelligent purpose, and seeing no ethical principle involved; and thus entirely ignoring the possibility of an intelligent self-existent Creator, and making matter eternal and deriving all existence, even life itself, from this material basis.

Against the doctrine of creation by an all-wise and benevolent God, they refer to the evils which appear to have been suffered in the age-long periods of geology. The animal races that inhabited the earth during the stages of its formation were successively created and annihilated after having entered upon that terrific struggle for existence even survivors of which eventually perished. They say, "Would an all-wise and infin-

itely benevolent Being create so many living beings, put them on a terrific struggle for existence, in which the weakest must succumb to the superior ingenuity and strength of the stronger, and in which even the successful strugglers must all, in the end, suffer the inevitable fate that awaits them, and die by violence, or in the course of nature, without the hope of survival? The evidences of cruelty and violence, causing untold pain and suffering, are revealed on every page of the great book of nature. The earth has, in fact, become a veritable charnel house, as the fossil remains found in every geological period abundantly testify. If there is a God, and He is so good, how can you reconcile this cruel warfare among His creatures with His benevolence? Can a being who is so good delight in so much suffering among His creatures which must be innocent of any violation of His laws?"

Such questions are exceedingly difficult to answer satisfactorily, even to ourselves. It might, indeed, be suggested that the greatest good to the noblest order of terrestrial beings could not be accomplished in any other way, and that when we come to understand the as yet unrevealed secrets of the divine purpose, it will prove a complete vindication of the ways of God, not only to mankind, but also to the rest of His vast creation. We know that many of the greatest blessings we enjoy are secured through labor and suffering.

Vicarious sacrifice seems to be the pathetic means through which we come into the possession and enjoyment of the necessities, no less than the luxuries of life. If, therefore, as it appears from this circumstance, human happiness is secured by sacrifice, may it not be that all the animal sacrifices of the geologic ages were the necessary prelude and preparation for the advent of man: that the changes, which evidently occurred during those vast periods, were necessary to fit the earth for human habitation, and that the successive revolutions which such preparation required, involved the creation and the annihilation of those many races of animals that peopled both the waters and the land? If it should prove true, in the end that

such is the case, it would seem to indicate, in its way, the noble and important position of man among terrestrial creatures since unnumbered sacrifices were offered by way of anticipation of his advent.

There is unquestionably a universal feeling among men that in our sinful state sacrifices must be offered, and may be effectual in securing a reconciliation with God. Among heathens the feeling is, of course, crude, and often expressed in a cruel way. But the sacrificial system of the Jews developed under divine sanction, and in fact, by divine command, affords a solid foundation for the belief, that sin must be atoned for by the shedding of blood. But that sacrifice is necessary for mankind, we have the final proof in the sacrifice of Christ, of which sacrifice all others are but types and shadows. Still this necessity of sacrifice in order to remove sin, and secure reconciliation with God, is no proof that countless numbers of animals must be sacrificed for man before he was in actual existence. The thought is suggested tentatively as a bare possibility, the supposition of which might serve to relieve the oppression of the mind. Neither is it offered as an apology for the conduct of the Creator, who, in the end, will doubtless solve the mystery to the satisfaction of all His creatures, even those who arraign His justice for doing what, to their minds, seems cruel and revolting; and thus He will fully vindicate His ways.

But as regards the great amount of suffering above referred to, we here quote the closing paragraph from the section on the "Ethical aspect of the struggle for existence," in Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace's book on Darwinism, page 36: "On the whole, then, we conclude that the popular idea of the struggle for existence entailing misery and pain on the animal world is the very reverse of the truth. What it really brings about is the maximum of life and of the enjoyment of life with the minimum of suffering and pain.

"Given the necessity of death and reproduction—and without these there could have been no progressive development of the organic world—and it is difficult even to imagine a system

by which a greater balance of happiness could have been secured."

This is admirably put, and we may take comfort in this belief. But yet the fact remains, that through most of the geologic ages, there was a most terrific and destructive struggle, in which, apparently, all the powers of nature, both organic and inorganic, raged with unceasing fury, and in which myriads of living creatures became victims of cruel violence and death.

It does not seem as if it was necessary, according to the original purpose of the Creator, that such a mighty death struggle should become the prelude and preparation for the advent of man on the earth. At least our short-sighted reason can form no logical argument for such a necessity that is satisfactory to reason.

May it not be possible, therefore, that all those titanic struggles were caused by the machinations of evil spirits, bent on frustrating the benevolent purposes of God? This suggestion can, of course, have no weight in any scientific mind which does not recognize the fact of creation, or the existence of a demoniac spiritual world. As the mere scientist cannot, on natural principles, demonstrate the existence of either, he rejects both, notwithstanding his scientific hypotheses often rest on *a priori* principles, such as he is ever ready to deny to the Christian theist. And while a true scientific demonstration is of unspeakable value, he is prone to forget that many of his so-called scientific demonstrations, of a given period, are extremely liable to be demolished by the more perfect observations of his successors. The history of every branch of science demonstrates this, one would think, with sufficient clearness and force to lead scientific charlatans to a more moderate estimate of the value of their own discoveries.

The Christian is not weakened in his faith because he cannot scientifically demonstrate every article of that faith. He believes in the existence of a spiritual world outside and independent of nature. He believes, too, that even finite spirits possess a preternatural power, not only because it is so declared

in the Bible, but because he sees the effects of such power in the history of man, and in the study of the course of nature. Notwithstanding the sublime reign of law, according to which this vast universe is governed, he sees everywhere the evil effects of some disturbing power, which is in direct antagonism and conflict with its laws. This he recognizes as indicating the presence of *ανομία*, or lawlessness. And this he attributes to the influence of evil spirits. If Satan could introduce sin into the world through the temptation and fall of our first parents, and thus bring about so much evil and misery among men, there is no logical reason why he could not exert an abnormal influence on the cosmical development of nature, and there also show himself the author of evil (*Ὁ Πονηρός*). And if he has such power, every conception we can form concerning his character would lead us to the belief that he would exercise it to the fullest possible extent.

What is true of Satan, is true also of all the angels that "kept not their first estate." They have set themselves to the task of antagonizing the will of the Creator. But as they were powerless to injure God Himself, they would exercise their hurtful influences on His creatures which they could injure. We know from observation and experience that sin is lawlessness. It comes in conflict everywhere with the laws of God and man. It is restive under the restraints of law. It seeks the destruction of all government, and would pull down and demolish it in every form, and inaugurate a reign of anarchy and lawlessness under which the good would be destroyed, and the evil run riot in its jubilee of wickedness. And since we attribute these things to the devil and his angels, who thus attempt to augment the miseries of men, and thereby find a vent for their spiteful rancor towards God, may we not also believe that the reign of terror, through which the earth passed prior to the advent of man, was the work of these demoniac agencies? In that case, their malevolence may have caused the *Tohu Vabohu* of Gen. 1: 2, that chaotic state of the earth out of which the Spirit of God brought it into the state of *Cosmos*. Thus by a lawless

intervention they would defeat the object of the creation at the very beginning, and baffle the divine purpose of manifesting His love, and glorifying His wisdom and power, in the creation and happiness of mankind.

In favor of this view we may observe that since the fall sin and evil have run parallel with the history of mankind, and with the development of the knowledge of God, and of the progressive revelation of the Messianic Kingdom. Human sinfulness, everywhere, as already intimated, tends to anarchy and ruin. It is the result of Satan's wickedness, whose aim is only to destroy. If from this we may reason backward, the analogy thus furnished might lead us to the conclusion that the revelations of the strata of the earth, and of the fossil remains imbedded therein, exhibit a long series of abnormities during the prehuman development of the earth, which are nothing else than the evil effects of demoniac agencies, working lawlessness and destruction in order to hinder the completion and perfection of the works of God. It is a demonstrated fact that men can and do modify and change the effects of natural laws; and it is not unreasonable, therefore, to suppose that evil spirits, who are more powerful than men, can turn the forces of nature to evil, and so produce destructive results.

Again, it is clear, to every devout student of holy Scripture, that the progressive revelation of the mystery of iniquity has kept pace with the ever-advancing revelation of God. Both reached their culmination "when the fulness of the time was come." Divine revelation attained the acme of its glory in the person and completed mission of the Messiah. And the devil, in mockery, or for the sake of imitation, made his boldest disclosures of himself in the demoniacal possessions which appeared during the incarnate life of Christ on earth. These seem to have been intended as a sort of diabolical travesty of the divine incarnation. But the old serpent over-reached himself. He thus opened the way for Jesus to prove His superior power by casting out the demons. Thus, in this particular, demoniac power seems to have reached its limit, and at that point the

Messiah exercises His power and authority, even over these wicked powers.

But still, Satan exercises a certain dominion over nature, evidence of which we find in the introductory chapter of the book of Job; though there his dominion is limited and overruled for good. There he sends Sabeans to carry away Job's oxen and to slay their keepers. He sends fire to burn up his sheep and consume the shepherds. He sends three bands of Chaldeans to carry away his camels and to slay the servants. And at last he sends a great wind from the wilderness to smite the four corners of the house, and it fell upon and killed his children.* It may be objected here that the book of Job is, perhaps, a drama and does not deal in real historical facts. But yet all Scripture dramas mean something; and the book of Job means that God exercises, in rectitude, His government, and that it is right, even amid the deeply afflictive circumstances that often harass His children. But at the same time it incidentally exhibits Satan exercising his malignant power over nature, although that power is limited and controlled by the higher sovereignty of God.

Again, in the temptation of Christ in the wilderness the tempter openly claims dominion over the kingdoms of the world, and offers to give it to Jesus if He will fall down and worship him. But, in reply, Jesus reminds him that it is written, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve." †

Moreover, Satanic power over nature seems to be implied when Jesus speaks to the storm on the Sea of Galilee. He *seems* to address the impersonal powers or forces of nature, but "the ultimate ground of this rebuke lay in the fact that the disturbances of nature were caused by unclean spirits." ‡ "Perhaps the 'prince of the powers of the air,' who 'raiseth winds' by the permission of God, had suspicion that He was coming now to cast that legion of devils out of the poor man,

* See Job 1: 13-19. † Matt. 4: 8-11.
‡ Lange, Com. on Matt. 8: 26, pg. 162.

and therefore poured this storm on the ship, designing, if possible, to have sunk Him, and prevent that victory."* Or his purpose may have been more extensive than that. It may have been to destroy Jesus and the young Church, and, in this way, frustrate the object of the mission of Jesus, namely, to save mankind from sin and death. And this seems all the more probable, because of his former failures; for example, in the slaughter of the "innocents," and in the temptation in the wilderness. But that evil spirits have some limited power over the elements of nature seems indisputable. Still there is no evidence that these demons represent any original or eternal principle, as, for instance, is supposed in the Persian myth of Ahriman. In that system of belief the evil principle appears to be independent of, and almost equal to, the good principle represented by Ormuzd. Here the evil principle has a beginning, is under the control of God, can go no further in his wicked purposes than God permits, for His own wise and holy purposes, and under this government even the evil is compelled, in the end, to subserve the righteous purposes of God. Still the evil actually exists in the natural world, and though its real meaning may be obscured under the term of "Cosmical principle," yet all the evidence attainable points to the same origin as that of evil in the moral sphere. Accordingly we read of the *prince of the power of the air; the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience;* † *the rulers of the darkness of this world; spiritual wickedness in high places;* ‡ *the prince of this world* § (κόσμος); *the god of this world* ‖ (τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου). All these epithets indicate the power of evil spirits over the elements and forces of nature, as it now stands; hence it is not unreasonable to conclude that the elemental disturbances of the geologic ages are attributable to diabolical influences, and that the terrific struggles, so destructive to animal life, had their origin in the same malignant powers.

* Compreh. Com. on Luke 8: 24, p. 472. † Eph. 2: 2.
‡ Eph. 6: 12. § John 12: 31. ‖ 2 Cor. 4: 4.

VII.

JESUS CHRIST, THE GREATEST REFORMER.*

BY REV. A. S. WEBER, A.M.

ALL our knowledge of the illustrious Character, whose noble life and sovereign achievements are to be our study this evening, must be gathered from the brief narratives of the four Gospels. In those writings Jesus is never called a reformer. The purposes essayed and the results effected by Him and by His teaching, unite, however, in showing that He is pre-eminently entitled to that designation. Those purposes were nothing short of the moral and spiritual reformation of the whole human race. Those results are written in letters of light upon every page of modern civilization.

Nearly two thousand years have run their course since He finished His earthly career. But the splendor of His name remains undimmed, its power undiminished. With ever increasing influence He is multiplying His victories. The thoughtful student observes that all the history which antedated His birth looked forward to Him. That which has been made since (as that will, which remains to be made,) looks back to the same Being. In Him all things end. All things have their beginning in Him. "In Him all things hold together." Must it not follow, therefore, as a necessary consequence, that the power of Christ's life and the principles of His teaching are constantly bending or breaking in the way of reformation every

* The last of a series of lectures on "The Great Reformers," given under the auspices of Chapter 39, Brotherhood of Andrew and Philip, in the Third Reformed Church, Baltimore, Md.

unholy life, unrighteous custom, selfish maxim and wicked institution to the blessed purposes of His supreme will?

What testimony does Christian history give to this inquiry? The consideration of its reply makes it necessary to recall the condition of human society and civilization at the period in which Jesus lived. The principal constituent factors entering into the historic life of that time were, the Jewish Religion, the Philosophy of Greece, Paganism and the Roman Empire. Were these factors in their severalty or unity adequate to meet human needs, or realize divine purpose? What is the answer to be given?

The Religion of the Jews, we know, had cultivated the soil in which spiritual life and moral virtue were to grow. But within what narrow boundaries that soil was confined is sadly manifest from the New Testament. There was a small circle of Israelites in whom indeed there was no guile; but the mass of the so-called covenant people had degenerated into a wilderness overgrown to darkness by external ceremonialism which no longer had either spiritual meaning or moral power. Having proved faithless to the trust which Jehovah had committed to it, Judaism was madly hastening toward its speedy doom.

The Philosophy of Greece had long wielded an immense intellectual power. But although still swollen with haughty pride, the hollowness of its pretensions had become known, its worth was generally mistrusted. It had failed to reveal the secrets of life. It had disappointed men's hopes. It had not maintained human virtue. It was utterly impotent to give peace to the heart for the present, had not a word of cheer for the future. For the guidance and help longed for, but few, therefore, continued to turn toward the wisdom of the several schools.

Paganism had long before this reached the abyss of its frightful work. Degrading the solemnities of religion itself into the means of gratifying the vilest passions, and bringing its votaries into despair, it could serve the race no better than by yielding itself to the swiftest extinction. The enormity of its nameless

vices and crimes is the only protection it has against complete exposure.

The Roman Empire, whilst it had not yet begun the last act in the extended drama of its life, had in fact already made its greatest contribution to the eternal purpose which runs through the ages. From his throne upon the Tiber, Augustus, with an iron arm, was ruling almost all the peoples of three continents. The armed legions and generals and governors of his colossal empire covered the earth. The world was enslaved to his will. A general peace was forced upon it by his power. The laws of the empire were everywhere recognized; its language, widely spoken; its customs, generally adopted. Thus it came to pass that the shameful immoralities, the hideous impurities, and the shocking crimes by which the whole social fabric of Latin society was honey-combed, spread through its influence like a deadly cancer, to every quarter of the globe. And accordingly no reformative virtue could be expected to issue from the civil power which then existed.

Contemplated from the moral and spiritual point of view, humanity, then, was "a great sweltering sea of heathen wickedness." Never has man's depravity of heart manifested itself in so universal and apparently irremediable ruin. The power of the civil law, the influence of philosophic light, the charm of pagan rite, the sacrifices and ceremonies of the Hebrew cultus —could all these have been united into one composite force it could not have availed to bring about the reformation needed in every department of public and private life.

To earnest, serious men, the future of the race looked hopelessly black. Poets and philosophers seemed at times to appreciate the awful solemnity of the situation. One sings that his hero, who is a type of suffering humanity, can never be delivered until some god descends for him into the black depths of Tartarus. Another says that man will never know God until He has revealed Himself in the guise of suffering man; and that when all is on the verge of destruction God sees the distress of the universe, and, placing Himself at the rudder,

restores it to order. A third declares that man cannot save himself; that for this purpose God comes to men—even into men. Convictions, like these, as to the desperate condition of humanity, and that the relief needed must come from beyond itself, were the necessary logical inferences to be drawn from their general knowledge of history and of personal experiences. The only ray of light still left was a faint hope in God—a hope which among the Jews looked for the Messiah, among the heathen to a God to them practically unknown.

The hour of this appalling darkness came, however, just before the dawn. Far from the busy marts of Roman commerce, far from the gay scenes of royal dissipation and unblushing licentiousness, far from the cultivated centres of Grecian refinement, in the quiet obscurity of a rural village, in the lowliness even of a rocky grotto used for sheltering beasts, the divinely-sent Deliverer of the race is born. The inhabitants of the haughty empire know it not. Did they know it, they should probably be too absorbed in worldly interests to find pleasure in so insignificant, so ordinary a thing as a new-born babe! But the fact is known, and its significance appreciated by the denizens of the celestial regions. A multitude of the heavenly host hastens to the retired spot where the event is taking place. They freight the midnight winds with heavenly music and the sweetness of their announcement is destined to become the joy of the whole world. Jesus, the Christ is born. The Sun of Righteousness has arisen with healing in His wings. The Word has become flesh and, dwelling among men, is revealing divine glory.

The date of Christ's birth synchronizes with the seven hundred and fiftieth after the foundation of Rome. This date, it may be remarked in passing, anticipates, by four years, the commonly received chronology of the year of our Lord. The error was made by Dionysius in the sixth century; and when his mistake was discovered, a thousand years afterwards, it was too late to correct it without much practical difficulty. A reference to the birth of Jesus reminds us at once of the

stupendous mystery of the Incarnation with which we are confronted at the very outset of our study of Christ's life. Of course it is not now proposed to enter upon a discussion of this central radical doctrine of the Christian Faith. With the Church Catholic, all of us, I assume, are ready to accept and confess that Jesus "was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." If so, we recognize here a fact which we are utterly unable to compass by any process of reasoning or thought, and before which it behooves us to bow down and worship in humble faith and adoring love.

And recognizing the mystery of the Birth, we are prepared to recognize also the mystery of the Person. No one trusting in the reality of history can now for a moment question the reality of a personage once living called Jesus of Nazareth. All acknowledge an individual by that name to have lived in Galilee, that His was a true human soul, endowed with all the ordinary human powers, susceptibilities, capacities and tendencies common to us all. But does that measure His entire being? Did not Jesus, by way of a gradual process of self-revelation, show Himself to be more than man? Through the manifestation of powers inherent in Him, through explicit instruction given His disciples, by positive assertion before the judge who tried Him, Jesus affirmed Himself to be at the same time also God. If we are to form anything like a correct estimate of Christ's doctrine and work, and of the results of reformation effected by both, it is fundamentally important that we should keep in mind the unexplained, the inexplicable nature of His divine-human Person. If we are to render intelligent service to Him, and persevere faithfully unto the end in our loyalty to His name, we, like the first disciples, need to know who and what He is who claims to have supreme authority over us, and who demands for Himself undivided allegiance from us.

Such knowledge was not withheld from those who drew near to Christ in the days of His flesh. "All through His ministry those who came near to him and felt the spell of His presence, His holiness, His power, were undergoing a training and a sift-

ing. Moment by moment, step by step, the accumulating evidence of His transcendently perfect humanity kept forcing upon them all more and more, the question which He would never let them escape, the question by which they were tested and judged: 'What think ye of Christ?' 'If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.'" * Thus for our intellects and for our hearts it is important to know that in Christ Jesus, Deity Himself was present incarnate. He is the God-man in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. The longer one reflects upon this unique Person, the readier one will be to acknowledge with St. Paul that, "Without controversy, great is the mystery of Godliness—manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory."

Aside from the visit and worship of the Shepherds, and the visit and gifts of the Wise Men from the East, there was nothing extraordinary attendant upon the birth of Jesus. The Child of 'the song and of the star' was circumcised according to the regulations prescribed by Hebrew custom, and after the same manner He was subsequently presented to the Lord in the temple. Upon returning from their flight into Egypt, the parents with their Child resume their home at Nazareth, and the only thing known of Jesus for years afterwards is that He "grew in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."

At the age of twelve He emerges for a moment from His retirement among the Galilean hills. He is seen in the temple at Jerusalem among the expounders of the law, hearing them and asking them questions, and declaring to His mother in His first recorded utterance, his conviction that He "must be about his Father's business." What an inspiriting motive for noble living that conviction thenceforward must have been in the career of this Youth of Nazareth! It throws as it were, a ray of light into the years that are now immediately before Him, allowing us to see, if nothing more, at least the bent of mind with which Jesus enters upon the earlier period of personal accountability.

* The Rev. R. C. Moberly, in "The Incarnation as the Basis of Doctrine."

So far as the Scriptures are concerned, the eighteen years that follow are veiled in impenetrable obscurity. Not one word is recorded to tell us what He was doing during these years; nothing as to the thoughts He was entertaining, or the purposes and plans He was forming. Incidentally He is once referred to as the Carpenter, from which it is inferred that during all that time His hands were engaged in honest and useful toil—toil by which He was winning bread for Himself and His widowed mother.

The whole of His time and attention, it is evident, however, were not given to the duties of the workshop. The mind which at the age of twelve astonished the learned by its "combinative insight and discerning answers,"* was not to be held in check by chisel, saw or plane. Somehow time was found to learn the Hebrew Scriptures, through and through. Were not the words of Moses and the Prophets so familiar to Him that at every exigency of His public ministry the apt and decisive quotation sprang promptly to His lips? During those years whatever other work may have engaged His efforts, He acquired a knowledge of the sacred writings, and of the God revealed in them, and at the same time came into possession also of equally profound knowledge of human life and of the human heart.

The age of thirty, at which He enters upon the duties of His public life, finds Him equipped accordingly "with the largest results of practical observation, and with the keenest insight into the tangled maze of human passions and interests. In comparison with Christ's knowledge of men and of man, so keen yet so sympathetic, so quick and so profound, the greatest master in this sphere falls below what can be called the second place. Thus in His student days at Nazareth, with no other means of culture than might be acquired by any humble artisan, He learned God as no philosophy or theology could teach. He learned man so that the contributions of history and literature were superfluous to Him. He also learned nature, with a love and an insight and sense of fellowship which the nineteenth

* See Edersheim's "Jesus the Messiah," Vol. I, p. 247.

century feels to be accordant with its own sentiments. So those quiet years at Nazareth were teeming years. A mind crowded with thoughts, a heart filled to overflowing with human interests and sympathies, and responsive to every suggestion of night and mountain and flower and field, can alone account for the richness of soul revealed to the world when the Messianic summons came. The power of the genius by which all these stores were acquired, and all these insights attained, was the pure heart which sees God, and in the divine light finds all things open and manifest." *

Of the personal appearance of Jesus, either at this time or before or after, we know nothing. It is well, no doubt, that the authentic records omit description of His outward presence. Far more important is it for us to know the mystery of His birth, the nature of His Person and the spotlessly pure and absolutely holy character with which He entered upon, prosecuted and finished His reformatory work. For knowing Him, in these respects to differ from all other men, we shall expect Him to entertain views as to the reformation needed, and as to the methods by which it was to be effected, which are essentially different from the views and methods of other reformers.

Savonarola, for instance, finding the government of Florence tyrannically harsh and oppressive, its rulers ambitious and immoral, attempted a reformation of the government by hurling violent denunciations against the sin and sinners of his time. Luther, discovering the doctrines of the Church to be erroneous and misleading, undertook a doctrinal reformation by methods which commended themselves to him as warranted by circumstances, and efficient for securing the end sought. Zwingli, seeing the corrupt morals of his age, sought to bring about a moral reformation by the preaching of the love and of the forgiveness of God. When Jesus inaugurated His work evils similar to these, we have seen, were everywhere to be observed. Religion, philosophy, government, morality, public and private, showed melancholy signs of needing to be reformed. But the greatest Re-

* The Rev. Charles H. Dickinson, in "The Perfecting of Jesus."

former of the ages made no direct attempt to reform particular errors, seemed not to care to reshape circumstances, governments or institutions until the root of the matter had been reached in the regeneration of men. His penetrating wisdom had taught Him how utterly futile it is to look for good fruit from the tree of human life so long as the worm of sin and death, gnawing at its heart, is not destroyed. He knew and taught, what even modern reformers are slow in learning, that all real and lasting reformation must begin with the regenerate heart and thence issue in righteousness and holiness of life.

Holding such views there is nothing strange, therefore, that at the opening of His public life, Jesus should demand what no teacher prior to Him had presumed to ask, namely, a new birth. The great Teacher come from God would not be satisfied simply with a man's external conformity to a moral pattern, however respectable that pattern might outwardly appear. For the meeting of Christian requirements it will not do to lop off a sin here, a vice there, and an error elsewhere in a life. Men with all the trappings of conventional moral respectability were known to Jesus, but to become disciples of His more than that was demanded. In His view the radical necessity for the reformation of fallen humanity is a birth from above, without which no man can see or enter into the heaven of perfect peace and abiding joy. And this view from which He never swerved during the three years of His official labors, determined the methods He employed in the pursuit of the work which had been given Him to do.

Here, then, we have the explanation of two facts in Christ's career which have sometimes puzzled the students of His life: First, why He should have opened His official ministry with benedictions instead of the promulgation of laws; and second, why He should have been content with so small a number of disciples as the reward of His laborious years on earth. He began His ministry with benedictions, because it was by the acceptance of what He had come to give, rather than by cold conformity to the letter of the law, that men were to be blessed with the re-

formed life needed by them and desired by God. Having seen men "dead in trespasses and sin," Jesus had come that believing in Him "they might have life and have it more abundantly." By accepting Him they accepted the regenerating power from above which secured for them not only deliverance from the bondage to the law, but warrant also for trust in the comforts of the Beatitudes: "Blessed, the poor in spirit; blessed, they that mourn; blessed, the meek; blessed, they that hunger and thirst after righteousness; blessed, the merciful; blessed, the pure in heart." Rightly interpreted words like these standing at the very heart of the Gospel, have immeasurably more power than the words of the Law for effecting reformation from error and sin, as well as for quickening and sustaining effort for holy and Christlike living. Men cannot be legislated out of sin, nor educated out. They must be loved out, blessed out. "God so loved the world,"—that is the key-note of the redemptive scheme, that must guide and sustain the song of the Gospel to its finishing chord.

Jesus was content with a small number of disciples because He knew that the ultimate success of His purpose depended not upon large numbers of disciples at the beginning or even at the end of His earthly work. Eternity was before Him; therefore He wrought not for a day. He was concerned to regenerate a single heart, or the hearts of a few, rather than technically to reform simply the external morals and customs, the maxims and institutions of a country, a race or an age. To change the latter without new-creating the former, he knew would in the end result only in failure. The devils of evil, in one or another form, would sooner or later return to a house swept and garnished, and make the last state of society worse than the first. To effect the former, even though it might be only in a single soul, or in a mere handful of faithful followers, would necessarily result finally in converting the kingdoms of this world into the kingdoms of God and of His Christ.

Prior to His crucifixion Jesus had said that the kingdom of God was "like leaven which a woman took and hid in three

measures of meal till *the whole* was leavened." Subsequent to the Resurrection, when all authority in heaven and earth had been given to Him, He commanded His disciples to "go into all the world and disciple all nations." With varying degrees of rapidity and success, the work enjoined in this commission has been doing, and even a casual survey of Christian facts warrants the hope that the permeating, reforming influences of the gospel are hastening the time when the entire race shall have felt its power, as this is predicted in the parable.

He would be a bold man, therefore, who should claim that Christ's views were mistaken, and that His methods were not the best for accomplishing a true and lasting reformation. Advanced skeptics even have not the hardihood to deny that Jesus has altered the entire current of human life, both as regards the individual and society. Renan, who certainly has not been studying the Gospels with an unprejudiced mind, feels constrained to say that "Jesus was the individual who made the species take the greatest step towards the Divine." Lecky, in whose mind a rationalistic bias is often manifest, declares that "it was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character which, through all the changes of eighteen centuries, has inspired the hearts of men with an impassioned love, has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments and conditions; has not only been the highest pattern of virtue, but the strongest incentive to its practice, and has exercised so deep an influence that it may be said that the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists." * Richter speaks of Jesus as "the holiest among the mighty, the mightiest among the holy, who with His pierced hands has lifted empires off their hinges, turned the stream of centuries out of its channels, and still governs the ages."

Appreciative testimony like this, which might readily be multiplied from a thousand additional sources, distinctively

* Lecky's "History of European Morals," Vol. II., pp. 8-9.

Christian, is valuable chiefly because it ascribes reforming power not only to the principles of truth inculcated and to the doctrines taught by Jesus, but to Jesus Himself. True, Christian principles and doctrines have done much in the way of transforming life and character in human society. Under their influence the morality and spiritual life of humanity would have received an upward impulse such as no ethical or philosophical system, ancient or modern, would have had the power of exerting. But, after all, it is not to abstract principles or teachings of the Christ that the unexampled moral and spiritual uplift given to our race by Christianity is to be ascribed. That power has come chiefly from Christ Himself.

He has set before men the supreme and absolutely perfect ideal of human life, and by uniting our lives with His through the gift of His indwelling Spirit, has made it possible for us not only to see and admire, but actually to reach out for, and in the end obtain for our own, the ideal thus set before us. And this is a deeply important matter. For is it not one thing to exhibit and gain admiration for an ideal, and a thing totally different to aspire for and at last win the ideal itself by its helpful and stimulating influence? Artists, by their creations on canvas or in stone, do the former; Jesus Christ alone has succeeded in accomplishing the latter by livingly uniting men with Himself.

The disciples whom He chose and trained had no lesson to learn that was more difficult in many respects than this of their "mystical union" with the Master. Now in this form and now in that it was repeatedly pressed upon their attention, and when at last the greatness of the fact itself was realized, they knew what it was to be "strong in the Lord and in the power of his might." They then appreciated that seeing Him as He is, meant in the end being like Him. After His bodily presence was no longer visibly present with them, they could still confidently and gratefully declare: We "can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth" us. This experience of the apostles, which is not exceptional, but by intent exemplary,

demonstrates that the powers of the God-united humanity are made available through the Spirit for every man. "The life of the Incarnate has not vanished from the earth; it is perpetuated through spiritual channels in the race of the spiritually redeemed. The 'New Man,' like the 'old man,' exhibits Himself as a self-propagating type, self-propagating by its own laws, having its seed in itself like every lower form or stage of life that has yet appeared." * Upon the basis, therefore, of the mutual incorporation of Christ and man, recognized in the well-known verse of one of our hymns,

"My life in Thee, Thy life in me,"

must we account for the ennobled condition in which the best civilization of our day surpasses that of antiquity, even as the vaulting heavens are higher than the earth. The new factor introduced by Christ has transformed the character of multitudes in every age; it has vivified man's cold and selfish heart by a new enthusiasm; it has redeemed, regenerated and emancipated the most depraved of human kind; it has wrought reformation in religion and philosophy, in customs and government, in principles and practices, in knowledge and institutions the world over, such as never have been, never can be paralleled by any other force.

Observe how this reforming power of Jesus is shown by the loftier conception of man now entertained everywhere in Christian lands. At the time of Christ's advent, notwithstanding the revelations of the Hebrew religion, the wisdom of the Grecian philosophy, and the protection of Roman law, what estimate did man put upon himself and his fellow-men? The course of every human being was too generally regarded as an aimless pageant. Men, even at their best, were nothing more than poor, suffering, worthless players, strutting for a little hour a mimic stage, and then destined to vanish forever.

Christ's life and teaching dispelled that delusion from the minds of His first followers, and their convictions have been

* Valling's "The Divine Man," page 220.

shared by succeeding generations ever since. Christian men know that every human life has originated in the wise and loving intention of God, and, that imperfect and sinful though that life may be, it is still capable of answering to sublime purposes here, and unless willfully obdurate to all the overtures of divine mercy, capable also of a blissful immortality. Despite the fact that the beauty of the divine imageship and likeness has been marred by his own acts, man is assured that he is still near and dear to the heart of God. Otherwise the Father could not have sent His Son into the world in order that the world through Him might be saved.

Being the object of divine regard, as taught by the word and confirmed by the work of Jesus, a man cannot overlook or deny the value of himself or of his fellow-men. That inference is immediate and unavoidable. And the impulse that it gives to the life of men is immense and continuous, as may be seen along the entire line of Christian effort and the spread of God's kingdom.

Observe also how this reforming power of Jesus is evidenced in the more just and vivid, the more elevating and inspiring conception of God now held wherever the sovereign instruction of the Gospel has gone. Some one has made the assertion—and personally I regard it true—that the greatest desideratum of our day for religious and theological, and even for practical, moral purposes, is a thoroughly Christian conception of God. If this is so now, what must be thought of man's needs in this regard prior to Christ and the writing of the New Testament? Outside the Jewish world God was a projection only of man himself into the invisible regions, governed by the same motives, prejudices and passions, and pleased with the same foibles and follies which gave delight to men. What Jesus did for man in this superlative department of thought can be measured when we call into clear remembrance what He by word and life taught us concerning Deity. God is a Spirit, the infinitude of whose blessed attributes can not be measured by the plummet of human reason. Thoroughly personal, He is omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, unchanging, and in character holy. As to

the essence of His being, the words "love," "life" and "light" approximate most nearly to an adequate description. He is "Our Father."

This idea of God, made familiar to the mind of the world through Jesus Christ, is the grandest, tenderest and most inspiring, men have ever received. "As the tides are lifted beneath the unseen pull of the moon, so human aspiration must be exalted when the vision of the infinite Author of the universe rises above it in majestic distinctness. As flowers and trees respond with blossoms, brilliant and fragrant, to the kiss of the sunshine when spring replaces the icy winter, so whatever is noblest in man, and whatever is most delicate, must answer to the appeal of a radiant discovery of the presiding Personal Glory from which order and life, power and love, incessantly proceed."*

Great seed-truths like these, intended to yield abundant harvests, were constantly sown by Christ as He journeyed up and down the rugged paths of Palestine with His disciples. Particulars as to these must be gathered from the evangelical narratives. His sublime teachings are there seen to be constantly illustrated by divine living. To confirm the truth of both He wrought signs and wonders such as He distinctly and unequivocally declared, no other man had done. He healed the sick, cleansed lepers, gave sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf and life to the dead. And though conscious that His career was soon to come to a tragical termination, He could rejoice not only because He had personally glorified his Father's name, but because it would continue to be glorified forever by the members of the Kingdom which He had established in the midst of men.

Of this the evidences began to be seen, and with constantly increasing glory they have been multiplying, from the very day on which His first disciples were chosen. Witness the richer and purer moral life which Christ's word and example, by the aid of His Spirit, have established among men. Witness the religious reformation which has been wrought—a reformation before which all others dwindle into the utmost insignificance.

*Storrs' "Divine Origin of Christianity," page 35.

Religion, instead of being a thing of outward rite and sacrifice, severed from life, is life itself, informed throughout by a true spiritual reverence and worship of God and by a sincere desire to conform in principle and conduct to the divine Will.

Witness, moreover, the benign power exerted by Christ and His teachings upon the relations subsisting between man and man. When Jesus was born vast multitudes were in the bondage of slavery. Upon these the haughty temper of their masters perpetrated terrible cruelties. Behold now what Christ has wrought! The legal and social status of these multitudes has been changed. The lofty wall, which seemed strong enough for all ages, to separate the classes, has yielded to the levelling, equalizing power of the Gospel. Instead of saying, as they once did, "We are better than you," men who are "transformed by the renewing of their minds" through the Spirit, cheerfully acknowledge, "You are as good as we." Christians recognize a common Father, and themselves as brethren entitled, therefore, all alike to the blessings promised to God's children.

The relation of society to woman has been changed to an equivalent degree by the same beneficent power. The pitiable position she to-day occupies among Pagan nations was once her lot everywhere. Christ has reformed that relation. His attitude towards women was the germ of their whole subsequent enfranchisement. The added protection, the enlarged opportunity, the tender recognition now accorded her by every true Christian man is a gift to her of Him who was the Son of Mary. This gift has not led her to forfeit her womanly glory; rather to perfect it in the love of her Lord. Her intensity of faith, the reckless completeness of her self-consecration to noble aims constitute a prophecy of the great things to be done by her when Christ's full reformation shall have placed her side by side with her brethren in perfect equality.

So the relation of man to the feebleness of child-life has also been altered. Before Jesus had lived and taught there was beyond the bounds of Israel scarcely any public recognition of duty towards little children. No chapter of heathen history is so

impressively sad as that which recounts the dealings of the State and of parents with those of innocent and helpless years. Children were left entirely to the perverse and fitful instincts of parents for their protection, training, succor and nurture; or if left to the State, to suffer from greater neglect if possible, and more aggravated inflictions of pain. The maxim by which fathers and mothers were governed in dealing with their offspring was seemingly the same as that of tyrants: "Muscularly I am able, therefore morally I may." And the resultant atrocities are too well known to call for description in this presence. Christ's sweet and gracious dealings with little children, and His tender references to them, have wrought changes which testify with deepest emphasis how happy has been the benefit wrought by the Gospel for the helpless estate of the little child.

Witness, in addition, the hallowing effect of the same reforming power upon the relation of society toward the aged and infirm, the ignorant and poor, the dependent, and criminal classes. We need not stay to speak with minuteness about these. On every hand all around us there are living and gratifying illustrations of the improved condition which those people enjoy under the Gospel. How large and generous the provision which is made for the comfort and happiness of those upon whom the burdens and infirmities of age are resting! How lavish the expenditure of money to provide opportunities for acquiring an education, even to the humblest of the poor! How bounteous the charities which support the numerous institutions dedicated to the relief of those whose impaired faculties or afflicted bodies make them dependent upon others' care! And in this care for others, it is not forgotten to make provision even for the fallen and criminal classes. The inhuman punishments have been reformed, the severities of their incarceration have been softened, and Christian effort is active in season and out of season in behalf of their protection against injustice, and for their reclamation, if possible, to deserved freedom from the restraints of the law. With reference to all these, Christian governments and institutions have been brought

under the moulding, reforming power of Christ's Spirit, and, like the Church, they now know not any distinctions of rich or poor, learned or unlearned, race or class. All have been glorified, as it were, into a higher life, through the transforming power of Jesus, the Christ.

Those chosen of God to originate reformations of this character, and to ameliorate the condition of mankind, are always the victims of their own calling. That seems to be a law governing every nation, and across that of the Jews it was written in letters of blood. Elijah, Amos, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, John the Baptist. all of these heroic men, Jesus knew, became the victims of priestly or royal power, or of the passions of the people. He was conscious that the accomplishing of His work meant for Himself a similar end. The end came not unexpectedly. He became a willing victim of the accursed cross, knowing that when lifted up to that commanding height, He should be able "to draw all men unto himself." That prophetic word of His, like many others, declared His conviction that His work was not finally done; that He expected it not to be done, when, with His lips trembling in death, He commended His spirit into the hands of His Father.

And so His reforming work goes constantly forward. It runs like a stream of life and glory through the ages. What He undertook is not yet fully accomplished. Kingdoms arrayed against kingdoms, the turbulence of vice in many individuals and nations, unconquered, villains revelling in their craft, assassins gratifying their thirst for blood, the weak oppressed by the strong, the innocent suffering from the guilty—these and like facts show that Christ must continue His reforming work still further before the evolution of history shall result in perfected society. The past of this process is full of hope and promise for the future. His sovereign rule and authority will ultimately find universal acknowledgment, and then in the new earth and new heaven wherein dwelleth righteousness, men shall be like Christ, sweet in sympathy, pure in holiness, vital with love, and His reforming workbe fully realized.

VIII.

CRISTIANITY A LIFE.

BY THE REV. AMBROSE M. SCHMIDT.

For nearly nineteen centuries the name of Christ has been upon the lips of friend and foe as has been no other name. For nearly nineteen centuries Christianity has permeated and moulded the thought and literature of the civilized nations of the earth.

For a like period of time the Religion of The Christ has transformed and recreated individuals and nations, and the end is not yet. Notwithstanding all this, men—Christian men—are more or less divided in opinion when called on to give answer to the question, "What is Christianity?" By some, Christianity is apprehended primarily as Revelation or Doctrine; by others, as a Religious Experience; by others, as Conduct or Character; by still others, as a Life.

In the midst of such diversity as this, can we find an answer to the question, "What is Christianity?" that will prove all-comprehensive? Is Christianity any one of these, or is it all of these?

Science recognizes two methods of investigation whereby the nature or character of a substance may be known, one the analytic, the other the synthetic. Which do we need in order that we may gain a full and clear apprehension of Christianity, the Religion of the Christ, the Religion of the eternal and natural Son of God?

Shall our knowledge of the parts determine our knowledge of the whole or *vice versa?*

Both methods are legitimate, both are really necessary parts

of one and the same system, yet for our present purpose we prefer the latter method. Know the whole and the parts are known. To return—When Christianity is defined as Revelation or Doctrine, Religious Experience or Character, we are asked to accept definitions which answer to certain phases of or essential elements in Christianity, but are not all-embracing nor all-comprehensive.

As the plant is more than roots, stem, leaves, branches, tissue, sap, bud and flowers, so Christianity is more than any one of these—yea, more than all of them taken together. The plant is primarily a living organism, as also is Christianity a living organism. The Religion of Christ is the only one of all the religions in the world in which the life of its founder is necessary for its perpetuity. Zarathustra, Gautama, Confucius may or may not have lived. Their teachings are mere moral and ethical principles, and do not require the life of him who set forth these precepts.

Mohammedism bears the name of its founder, but his followers are free to acknowledge that Mahomet is dead. Because Mahomet is dead, therefore, Mohammedism must die; it is even now disintegrating, for it has no life in it. It is recorded that when Mahomet died, Abu Bekr, who afterwards became the first Caliph, went forth from the chamber of death proclaiming, "Whoso worshipeth Mahomet let him know that Mahomet is dead; but whoso worshipeth God let him know that God liveth and dieth not."

In this one thing the uniqueness of the Christian Religion is manifest. It is the religion of a living Person—a religion that is permeated by His life, quickened and energized by His Spirit, and because of this ever-living, ever-present Spirit of Christ Christianity cannot die, for the Son of God "liveth and dieth not."

In the early Church, before the facts and truths of the Master's life had lost their living reality and had been exchanged for dogmas, Christianity was recognized as a living power, present in the hearts of believers, permeating, transforming

and recreating them. St. Paul exclaims, in writing to the Galatians: "I have been crucified with Christ, yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith."

The Christianity of the martyrs was not merely a matter of religious experience, revelation nor doctrine; not a mere question of conduct nor of character, but a question of life, a personal life communion with God through a personal Saviour.

In answer to the attacks made upon them, the early defenders of the faith proudly pointed to the effect of this new religion upon the lives of its professors. Said an early writer: "They pass their days on earth but are citizens of heaven. They obey the prescribed laws, and at the same time surpass the laws by their lives. They love all men, and are persecuted by all." Very early, however, in the Mediæval period, there was manifested a tendency to regard Christianity rather as a revelation than as a life, and to understand by revelation mainly a system of dogmas or doctrines. Such a condition of affairs most easily opened the way for the age of Intellectualism. Here, faith is represented not so much as a personal trust in a living Saviour as an assent to a system of doctrines in which the will of the individual is alone active in accepting the doctrines of the Church. Faith meant intellectual assent to certain dogmas or traditions. With such *credo* as this the Church readily passed into the ecclesiastical phase, a phase of organization. The mighty structure of the Roman hierarchy rapidly arose and Christianity became a formulary of traditional or doctrinal precepts accepted and obeyed by those who were named Christians. So great stress was laid upon the necessity of works that faith, a living personal faith almost ceased to be looked for or required in the individual believer.

Then came the age of mysticism, and after that the evangelical age. Now repentance and faith take the place of

obedience and works. The Reformation introduced an age of Evangelical Christianity and produced a great variety of phases, prominent among which was Experimentalism.

Christianity henceforth must be a matter of experience; something to be felt, tried, proven and if found worthy of confidence, accepted and believed in. The latter days of Experimentalism are upon us. What of the future? says a recent writer. "The laws of progressive religion operate like those of politics, and are governed by antecedent habits. From some of the tendencies of modern Christians we may gauge what the nature of their coming forth may be," then he adds later on: "From these evidences we gather that the new phase of Christianity will be one of conduct." In so far as he makes conduct the outward expression of an inward life, his statement may stand, but very much of so-called Christian conduct has very little that is in sympathy with the demand for a life that is lived in and with Christ Jesus, who is Himself the only source of all life and the only Fountain from whence can flow that real spirit-life requisite for all true Christian conduct or character. All character—all good character—is not necessarily Christian character; indeed, may it not be said that all good character (morally good) does not become Christian character!

Morality is not Christianity, though for many those two terms appear to be synonymous.

It was the character of Christ as manifested by Him which caused the germinal faith of His disciples to unfold, but the revelation of His character was the revelation of His life. In John 2: 11, we read: "This beginning of his signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested his glory (character): and his disciples believed on him." For them, however, Christianity meant nothing less than a *personal, living union with a living personal Christ.*

That the Religion of Christ is more than Revelation or Doctrine—yea, more than the Scriptures themselves—is manifest from the words of our Saviour as He addressed the Jews when in Jerusalem attending the feast: "Ye search the Scriptures,"

He said, "because ye think that in them ye have eternal life: and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to me, that ye may have life." John 5: 40. The Scriptures were given to them as a means to an end. They erred in that they made what was designed merely as a means, serve for them as the end. They rested their faith in the Scriptures.

So men err to-day when Christianity is apprehended primarily, as revelation or doctrine (a learned theologian's statement to the contrary notwithstanding): "These are they which bear witness of me." Finger-boards they are, pointing the way to the fountain of life, but unable of themselves to give to men that life. Nowhere do we read: "He that believeth in the Scriptures hath eternal life," but plainly it is taught that "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life," John 3: 36. Again, the Religion of Christ is more than Personal Experience or character. Personal Experience may aid in attaining to true Christian character; conduct may afford personal experience and evidence the nobility of character, but that which is born of the flesh remains flesh, and is of the earth earthy unless there be a dying unto the old Adamic life and an implanting into, a living of the new Adamic life. St. Paul, in writing to the Colossians, boldly affirms: "For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God."

What can he mean but that they, as Christians, were living a new life in Christ, a life differing in all things from their former life? In his High Priestly prayer (John 17: 3) Jesus says: "And this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ."

Here knowledge, at first sight, might appear to mean a knowledge gained through intellectual apprehension or experience. "The word 'know' does not express perfect but inceptive and ever-growing knowledge." Knowledge of the Father and of the Son is neither the condition of the life nor life itself. Life is that state in which we are introduced to the knowledge of the Father and the Son, and when that life is perfected in us we shall know them as they are. Knowledge is therefore

dependent on life, for there can be no knowledge without life, and the life which they who are in Christ now have is *eternal life.*

The tendency of the age seems to be rather to hold eternal life before the Christian as a reward to be given hereafter, instead of a present possession. Let this latter truth receive due emphasis and the Religion of Christ can no longer be apprehended as mere Revelation, Doctrine, Experience or Character. Christianity is not one of the many religions of the world, but the only religion that offers eternal life as a present possession. If this be true, can we rest satisfied with any definition of Christianity that does not sum up or embrace all of its many phases in that one, all-comprehensive word LIFE! That eternal life is now offered to the believer; that eternal life is the present possession of those who have "put on Christ" is clearly taught both by Christ Himself and by the Apostles.

Hear our Master speak: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *hath* eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day," John 6: 54. Hear the beloved John declaring: "And the witness is this, that God *gave* unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son *hath the life*, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life. These things have I written unto you that ye may know that *ye have eternal life*, even unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God," 1 John 5: 11–13. Through faith we are made partakers of this life, the believer receiving his new life from Him who is the source of all life.

There are Christians and Christians, just as there are Americans and Americans real and nominal. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven," Matt. 7: 21. Many there are who have been named Christians; who have been implanted into Christ through the sacrament of baptism; who have publicly confessed Christ as their Master, yet for whom the Church of Christ possesses no more merit than an ordinary fraternal circle or

brotherhood. They have been ingrafted into the vine but have failed to appropriate the life of the vine. They have never grown. Notwithstanding the fact that there are many lifeless members in the Church of Christ their presence in nowise contravenes the truth that Christianity is a life. The presence of lifeless branches on a tree does not warrant the inference that the tree itself is lifeless, so long as the tree has many other branches that bear foliage and fruit. It is, however, an evidence that these lifeless branches have failed to take up into themselves the life of the tree. In other words, Confession is not necessarily an evidence of living faith. Hearing joined to confession will not insure any man's salvation. The receiving of the word and the doing of the Master's will—these are the fruits whereby the confessor and hearer evidences the fact that his life is nourished by Christ's life, and that for Him Christianity means a life union with a living Christ. The Church is the body of Christ. The believers are members of His body. This community of believers incorporate in His body are known as Christians. The religious belief which they profess is named Christianity—so named because of that personal Christ who lives in His Church by His Spirit, and through His Spirit dwells in the hearts of His believers. The Religion of Christ, the Religion of the Eternal and Natural Son of God is therefore primarily a life—IT IS LIFE ITSELF!

Apprehend Christianity as a life and Revelation, Doctrine, Experience and Character will flow forth as the natural streams of one common fountain, each revealing distinct phases of that life, yet each finding its source in Him whose ever-present Spirit abideth in the hearts of believers, in whose lives is mirrored the image of the only begotten Son of God, whose followers we are.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS. A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. By Milton S. Terry, S. T. D., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in Garrett Biblical Institute. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1892. Price, $3.00.

This is a handsome volume of 500 pages, and treats with ability the subjects usually considered in such a treatise. We can freely commend it for use in this department. What it explains in reference to the principle of interpretation in general, and of the interpretation of the Bible in particular, is very important and necessary. But we have felt for some years that sufficient attention is not given in such treatises to the *difference* between the Bible and all other books. What is this difference? Briefly, it is that the Bible treats of supernatural, revealed truth, whereas all other books treat of what we may designate as natural truth, or truth in the sphere of the natural creation. But, it is said, is not all truth one? In one sense, yes; in another sense, no. The truth in the Bible relates to the *new creation* in Christ Jesus, and in order to apprehend this order of truth it is necessary first of all to have a proper idea of, and faith in, that creation. Just as knowledge of the person of Christ cannot be attained to merely by the natural reason, but requires faith in the supernatural constitution of His person, so it is necessary, first of all, to grasp the unique character of truth as it holds in the new creation, in order to come *en rapport* with the teaching of the inspired Scriptures. We approve all that is given in this work as proper and necessary in order to a right interpretation of the Bible, but it needs to be supplemented, in our opinion, by a proper representation of the difference between the Bible and all other books. The Bible is not only the *Word of God;* nature is also, in a sense, a word of God; but the Bible is the word of God in relation to a new order of supernatural truth revealed in Jesus Christ. Then a central principle must be found for a right interpretation of the Scriptures. This centre of the Scriptures is the Lord Jesus Christ. He is the light and life of the Bible. Christ said to the Jews: "Ye do search the Scriptures because in them ye think ye have eternal life, *and they are they which* TESTIFY OF ME." St. Paul studied the Scriptures for years without understanding the first truth they con-

tained. When he learned to know Christ he saw *Him* in every page, and now came to a new understanding of the sacred record. Hence we would start our Hermeneutics with a consideration, first of all, of what the Bible is, and then the central principle of the Bible, and then take up what is presented in this volume. We would like to extend these remarks, but we shall reserve what else we have to say for a future occasion.

HOMILETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF GENESIS. By Rev. J. S. Exell, M. A., and Rev. T. H. Seale, A. K. C. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1892. Price, $3.00.

This is the first volume of the American authorized edition of "The Preacher's COMPLETE HOMILETIC COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT." The entire work has been recently completed in London, and has been received with much enthusiasm by many of the clergy of all denominations. It is the purpose of the publishers to issue an American edition from plates supplied by the English publishers, and, if they can secure sufficiently large advance orders, put the price at about one-half that of the English edition, which imported in single sets costs about $60 per set.

The publishers say: "Among the special features of this great work which have influenced us in our determination to print an American edition are:

"1st. The exhaustive character of this Commentary. Its editors claim (and their claim seems justified) that the work opens up for homiletic use every available verse or paragraph of the Old Testament that can be turned to homiletic advantage. For instance, notwithstanding the paucity of homiletic literature on the Book of Jeremiah, the volume on Jeremiah will be found to contain in brief or fuller form about eight hundred and fifty suggestive treatments of texts for sermon use, among which are no fewer than four hundred and seventy sermon outlines upon texts which appear, so far as literature affords evidence, to have been hitherto unused by preachers. The same is true to a greater or less degree of the Book of Kings and other portions of the Old Testament which have hitherto been but sparsely used as sources for texts for sermons.

"2d. The Commentary is the work of a score of distinguished homilists (see enclosure). The original work in the volumes is of the highest excellence, and the selections have been made with great skill and discrimination. Every effort has been made on the part of the learned editors to store in these volumes the best of the homiletic study of all ages and of all countries. Besides the indices in the several volumes there is an elaborate and copious index volume to the whole. The work is most highly commended by preachers and by the press of England."

As a rule homiletical commentaries are not the best for a critical study of the Scriptures, but every rule has its exceptions. The

danger with them is that they make moral lessons the principal object of study, and these moral lessons become merely *naturalistic, i.e.*, they overlook the deep spiritual sense of Scripture as a *super-natural* revelation. But the volume before us seems to do full justice to the proper sense of the text, and in addition gives its homiletical use. It is adapted to the wants of ministers, and will no doubt circulate largely among them.

THE BOOK OF JOB. By Robert A. Watson, D.D., author of "Judges and Ruth," "Gospels of Yesterday," etc. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 E. Tenth Street, 1892. Price, $1.50.

This volume belongs to the series known as "The Expositor's Bible." It is an interesting work on an interesting subject.

Of the book of Job Thomas Carlyle says: "It is one of the grandest things ever written by man, a noble book—a book for all men. Such living likenesses were never since drawn. Sublime sorrow, sublime reconciliations; oldest choral melody, as of the heart of manhood; so soft and great as the summer midnight; as the world with its seas and stars,—there is nothing written, I think, of equal literary merit." Dr. Watson designates it "the first great poem of the soul in its mundane conflict, facing the inexorable of sorrow, change, pain and death, and feeling within itself at one and the same time weakness and energy, the hero and the serf, brilliant hopes, terrible fears;" and he further asserts that "with entire veracity and amazing force this book represents the never-ending drama renewed in every generation and in every genuine life."

In his exposition of this sublime book, this grand and divinely-inspired poem, Dr. Watson is very happy. In an attractive and elegant style he elucidates its character and wisely comments on its contents. No one we think can read his masterly exposition without feeling thankful to him for its preparation. We heartily commend it therefore to all interested in Bible study. The learned and the unlearned can alike read it with profit.

THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS. By the Rev. James Denny, B. D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 E. Tenth Street, 1892. Price, $1.50.

This volume, also, like the one just noticed, forms part of "The Expositor's Bible." It presents a highly interesting, as well as an able and instructive exposition of the earliest of the Epistles of the great Apostle to the Gentiles. Among the subjects discussed are, "The Signs of Election," "Conversion," "Charity and Independence," "The Dead in Christ," "The Day of the Lord," "The Man of Sin," and "The Christian Worth of Labor." The comments of the author are throughout very judicious and deserving of careful consideration. The work is in every respect worthy of a place in the series to which it belongs, which is high praise.

FROM THE USHER'S DESK TO THE TABERNACLE PULPIT. The Life and Labors of Charles Haddon Spurgeon. By Rev. Robert Shindler, author of "Northeram Hall," etc. Fourth Thousand. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East 10th Street, near Broadway. 1892. Price, $1.50.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon was a truly apostolic man. As a preacher he made a deep impression on the age in which we live. The life of such a man is always worth studying. The present volume is therefore a desirable one. That its statements may be accepted as correct is vouched for by the fact that the proof-sheets of this "Life," with the exception of those of the last chapter, were revised at Mentone under Mr. Spurgeon's supervision during his last illness. Besides the facts of his life, the volume also contains a number of portraits of Mr. Spurgeon, taken at different times, together with other interesting illustrations which adds to its value.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D.D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London. Vol. XVI., Jeremiah XX.–Daniel. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, London and Toronto. Price, $1.50.

In this volume Dr. Parker presents to us his discourses on the later chapters of Jeremiah, together with those on the Lamentations of Jeremiah, the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, and the Book of Daniel. These discourses are all distinguished by brilliant rhetoric and strikingly expressed thought. To ministers of the gospel they will prove themselves highly suggestive, and to readers generally they can scarcely fail to be edifying and inspiring. As in the previous volumes of this series, the discourses are supplemented by "Handfuls of Purpose," drawn from the texts and topics, and especially prepared for the use of teachers. The volume also contains a number of prayers.

PRACTICAL REFLECTIONS ON THE BOOK OF RUTH. By M. C. Horine, A.M., Pastor of St. James' Lutheran Church, Reading, Pa. With an Introduction by Rev. Eli Huber, D.D., Pastor of Messiah Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, Pa. Lutheran Publication Society, No. 42 North Ninth St., Philadelphia, Pa. Price, 50 cents.

These Reflections were originally prepared for the members of the author's own congregation, and presented to them in nine discourses which form the chapters of this little volume. They are of a truly practical character, and cover the whole Book of Ruth in a clear, connected and orderly way. They are therefore a practical Exposition of the book. In preparing them the author's aim has been, first of all, to attract attention to the charming story of Ruth, and create an interest in it, and in the second place to raise in the minds of others "a feeling of high self respect, of unwavering faith in God, of cheerful hope in days of adversity, and of abiding conviction that true nobility of character, true piety and worth, may be found among those who tread the humble walks of life, as well as among

the more famed sons and daughters of men." The work is one which ought to have a wide circulation, and which can scarcely fail to inspire in those who read it a deeper sense of the beauty and blessedness of holy living.

ORDER OF SERVICE WITH THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM, for use in the Sunday-school, the Catechetical Class and Church-Work Societies. Compiled and arranged by Rev. Nathaniel Z. Snyder, South Bethlehem, Pa. 1891. Price, 25 cents.

This is an admirable little book. It consists of the Heidelberg Catechism, a brief Catechism of the Church Year, Orders of Service for the different Sundays of the Church Year, and Prayers for special occasions. It is designed for use in the Sunday-school, and at stated meetings for Catechetical instruction. In its preparation a real want has been supplied. On account of its merits it ought to find a place in every Reformed Church Sunday-school. Its general use could scarcely fail to advance true spiritual knowledge and growth. We heartily commend it to the attention of the ministers and Sunday-school superintendents of the Reformed Church.

GENESIS I. AND MODERN SCIENCE. By Charles B. Warring, Ph.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1892. Price, $1.00.

The object of this work is to show that the contents of the First Chapter of Genesis are in perfect accord with the established facts of Science, and that therefore it bears in itself evidence of being the work of one who exhaustively understood the import and the order of all phenomena, and from an infinite abundance selected those suited to his purpose. The argument is presented in the form of a discussion continued through nine evenings with a Professor of Natural Sciences. The book is well written, and gives evidence of considerable scholarship and ingenuity. Those interested in the subject to which it relates will find it deserving of attention.

OUR LORD'S LIFE. A Continuous Narrative in the Words of the Four Gospels according to the Common Version. Arranged by James Strong, S.T.D., LL.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1892. Price, 45 cents.

This Life of our Lord is substantially a condensation of the text of the author's *Harmony of the Gospels*, published in 1852, with such changes as were needed to adapt it to the present purpose. It gives, in regular chronological order, without omission or repetition, all the events and discourses of our Lord's life in the exact language of the sacred evangelists as found in the Authorized Version, and at the same time indicates the Gospel, by chapter and verse, from which each particular is derived. Besides a brief preface by the author, explaining the character of the work, it is also prefaced with a very full table of contents, a textual index, and tables of measures,

weights, time and winds, mentioned in the New Testament. The work is one of the very best of its kind, and will be found of real service in the study of Christ's life.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. By John Wiley, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey, Vol. I. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1892. Price $3.00.

This volume forms part of the "Library of Biblical and Theological Literature," edited by George R. Crooks, D.D., and John F. Hurst, D.D. It is the Fifth Volume of the Series, and like those tha have preceded it a work of superior merit. It is made up of an Introduction in which theology is defined, its source and scientific basis pointed out, and its systemization considered; and in three parts which treat respectively of Theism, Theology, and Anthropology. All these subjects are discussed in a clear, forcible and able manner. The work is especially deserving of attention as representing the present theological views of one of the largest and most influential Christian denominations of our country. We are sorry that our time and space will not permit us to give a fuller notice of the work. We may do so however in a future number of the Review.

A HEREDITARY CONSUMPTIVE'S SUCCESSFUL BATTLE FOR LIFE. By J. M. Buckley, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1892. Price: Paper 30 cents, Cloth 50 cents.

This essay, we are told in a preparatory note, consists of articles which appeared originally in "The Christian Advocate," and some additional matter of importance. It presents some very important facts and should be read by all who would maintain their health unimpaired, as well as by those who would obtain relief in pulmonary troubles. The principles underlying the treatise we believe to be sound ones.

THE CHURCH OF TO-MORROW. Addresses delivered in the United States and Canada during the autumn of 1891. By W. J. Dawson, author of "Makers of Modern English," "The Redemption of Edward Strahan," etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1892. Price $1.00.

RELIGION FOR THE TIMES. By Lucian Clark, D.D, Assistant Editor of "The Christian Advocate." New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1892. Price $1.25.

These volumes are of a popular character, designed to bring out the practical side of Christianity. The first one named aims to show the ethical element in Christianity as seen in its application to the personal and social wants of man. They contain good thought clothed in good style, and not too profound for reading in the warm months of a summer vacation.